HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

Department of Foreign Language Education

English Language Teaching Program

NEGOTIATED MEANING MOVES IN ONLINE PROBLEM-BASED TASKS IN EFL CLASSES

Ata Can SEZGİN

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2024

With leadership, research, innovation, high quality education and change,

To the leading edge... Toward being the best...

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

Department of Foreign Language Education

English Language Teaching Program

NEGOTIATED MEANING MOVES IN ONLINE PROBLEM-BASED TASKS IN EFL COURSES

EFL DERSLERİNDE PROBLEME DAYALI ÇEVRİMİÇİ GÖREVLERDE ANLAM SÖYLEŞMESİ HAREKETLERİ

Ata Can SEZGİN

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2024

Acceptance and Approval

To the Graduate School of Educational Sciences,

This thesis prepared by **ATA CAN SEZGİN** and entitled "Negotiated Meaning Moves in Online Problem-Based Tasks in EFL Courses" has been approved as a thesis for the Degree of **Master** in the **Program of English Language Teaching** in the **Department of Foreign Language Education** by the members of the Examining Committee.

Chair	Assist. Prof. Dr. Sevgi ŞAHİN
Member (Supervisor)	Prof. Dr. Nuray ALAGÖZLÜ
Member	Assist. Prof. Dr. Nilüfer Can DAŞKIN

This is to certify that this thesis has been approved by the aforementioned examining committee members on …/…/…. in accordance with the relevant articles of the Rules and Regulations of Hacettepe University Graduate School of Educational Sciences, and was accepted as a **Master's Thesis** in the **Program of English Language Teaching** by the Board of Directors of the Graduate School of Educational Sciences from ...../...../.....

Prof. Dr. İsmail Hakkı MİRİCİ

Director of Graduate School of Educational Sciences

Abstract

An inevitable problem of interaction has been misunderstandings. Language classrooms are one of those contexts in which these communicational breakdowns occur. This study is conducted to investigate Turkish EFL students' negotiation of meaning (NoM) moves which they utilized while they were doing an online problem-based task. 20 Turkish students enrolled in an intermediate-level EFL course at a state university are paired (n=10) and their conversations are recorded. The recordings are transcribed and instances of meaning negotiation are identified and coded. The study employed basic descriptive statistics to show the distribution of each meaning negotiation type among all data and pairs. Analyzing the discourses from transcription, some preferences are revealed. The study found that Turkish EFL students negotiated meaning during online problem-based tasks and employed a variety of NoM types, the most common type being clarification requests. The students showed a preference for correcting and repeating themselves rather than their partners. Instances of checking for self-confirmation were identified and it was suggested that they constituted promising research on understanding communicational strategies. The importance of the study was to draw attention to NoM practices in Turkish contexts and the importance of including strategy training in NoM by explaining the purposes for NoM utilized in immediate online interaction. The study contributes to the literature by highlighting the importance of meaning-making processes and their inclusion in curriculums to foster successful language exchange and co-construction of language, which contribute to facilitating second language acquisition.

Keywords: negotiation of meaning, problem-based task, online interaction, strategy training.

Öz

İletişimde kaçınılmaz olan sorunlardan biri anlaşmazlıklardır. Dil sınıfları bu iletişim bozukluklarının meydana geldiği bağlamlardan biridir. Bu çalışma, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin çevrimiçi probleme dayalı bir görev yaparken kullandıkları anlam söyleşmesi (AS) hareketlerini araştırmak için yürütülmüştür. Bir devlet üniversitesinde orta seviye İngilizce kursuna kayıtlı 20 Türk öğrenci ikili olarak eşleştirilip (n=10) konuşmaları kaydedilmiştir. Kayıtlar yazıya geçirilmiş ve anlam söyleşmesi örnekleri tanımlanıp kodlanmıştır. Çalışmada, her anlam söyleşmesi türünün tüm çalışmadaki ve çiftler arasındaki dağılımını göstermek için basit tanımlayıcı istatistikler kullanılmıştır. Söylemler transkripsiyondan analiz edildiğinde bazı örüntüler ve yönelimler bulunmuştur. Araştırma, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen Türk öğrencilerinin çevrimiçi probleme dayalı görevler sırasında anlam üzerinde söyleştiklerini ve çeşitli AS türlerini kullandıklarını, en yaygın türün ise açıklama talepleri olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. Öğrencilerin partnerlerinden ziyade kendilerini düzeltmeyi ve tekrarlamayı tercih ettiği bulunmuştur. Kendine onay kontrolleri örnekleri belirlenmiş ve bunların araştırılmasının iletişim stratejilerini anlama konusunda umut verici olabileceği öne sürülmüştür. Çalışmanın önemi, doğrudan çevrimiçi etkileşimde kullanılan AS'lerin amaçlarını açıklayarak, Türkiye bağlamındaki AS uygulamalarına ve AS'nin strateji eğitimine dahil edilmesinin önemine dikkat çekmesidir. Çalışma, ikinci dil edinimini kolaylaştırmaya katkıda bulunduğu gösterilen başarılı anlam oluşturma ve dilin birlikte inşasını teşvik etmek için anlam söyleşmesi süreçlerinin ve bunların müfredata dahil edilmesinin önemini vurgulayarak literatüre katkıda bulunmayı hedeflemiştir.

Anahtar sözcükler: anlam söyleşmesi, probleme dayalı görev, çevrimiçi etkileşim, strateji eğitimi.

Acknowledgements

I would like to start with my advisor, who was also my teacher during my BA years, Prof. Dr. Nuray ALAGÖZLÜ for her assistance and guidance. A special thanks for not letting me quit the program by reaching out to me when I was feeling down last year. I will be forever grateful. I also thank my thesis defense committee members Assist. Prof. Dr. Sevgi Şahin Assist. And Prof. Dr. Nilüfer Can DAŞKIN for their invaluable feedback and support.

Thanks to my supportive parents I feel blessed to be in their presence. Thank you Mom for being a role model and influencing me (even though you may not be aware of this) to be an English teacher who loves his job like yourself. Thank you Dad for your continuous support both in my academic career and life.

I would like to show gratitude to all my close friends and my cousins for being good friends and companions, participants of the study for participating in the study, and my new MacBook for drastically changing my pace of writing.

Finally, I want to thank Mustafa Kemal Atatürk for what he has done for our country and the education of the Turkish people. He also showed me that it is possible to wholeheartedly miss someone even if you have never actually met them. Even writing about you brings tears to my eyes. Rest in peace.

Table of Contents

Acceptance and Approval ii

Abstract..... iii

Öz iv

Acknowledgements..... v

List of Tables vii

List of Figures ix

Symbols and Abbreviations..... x

Chapter 1 Introduction..... 1

Statement of the Problem 2

Aim and Significance of the Study 5

Research Questions..... 7

Assumptions..... 7

Limitations 8

Definitions 9

Chapter 2 Theoretical Basis of Research and Literature Review..... 11

Problem-Based Learning Using Online Tasks 11

Negotiation of Meaning..... 13

Types of Meaning Negotiation Strategies 18

Meaning Negotiation Research in the Literature..... 22

Chapter 3 Methodology..... 28

Research Design..... 28

Setting and Participants..... 29

Data Collection 29

Discourse Analysis 31

Data Analysis 34

Chapter 4 Findings, Comments and Discussion..... 38

Distribution of Meaning Negotiation Moves in the Research Data..... 38

Types of Meaning Negotiation Moves in the Research Data..... 40

Comprehension Checks…….....45

Confirmation Checks…….....46

Self-confirmation Checks……..….....47

Clarification Checks.....49

Corrections…….….....50

Repetitions…….....53

Co-construction…….....55

Continuers…….....55

Avoiding Negotiation of Meaning…….....56

Chapter 5 Conclusion and Suggestions 60

Summary of the Research.....60

Implications for EFL Classrooms and Teachers.....63

Suggestions for Future Research.....67

References 70

APPENDIX-A: Jefferson (2004) Transcription Convention 81

APPENDIX-B: Consent Form.....82

APPENDIX-C: Ethics Committee Approval…….…….....83

APPENDIX-D: Declaration of Ethical Conduct..... 84

APPENDIX-E: Thesis Originality Report..... 85

APPENDIX-F: Yayımlama ve Fikrî Mülkiyet Hakları Beyanı 86

List of Tables

Table 1. *Distribution of negotiated meaning moves and avoidance of NoM* 39
Table 2. *Distribution of types of NoM in the research data* 41
Table 3. *Distribution of NoM types among pairs*..... 42

List of Figures

Figure 1. *Podcast Homework Sheet* 31

Symbols and Abbreviations

SLA: Second language acquisition

ELT: English Language Teaching

L2: Second/Foreign language

L1: First language

NoM: Negotiation of meaning

CS: Communication strategy

NS: Native speaker

NNS: Non-native speaker

FTA: Face-threatening act

Chapter 1

Introduction

Engaging in discussions can sometimes be challenging, as misinterpretations and uncertainties may arise. Grice (1989) perceives conversations as a cooperative act that requires speakers to meet certain maxims. When one maxim is flawed, mutual understanding needs to be established. In situations where a speaker fails to grasp the response they have received, both parties may need to collaborate to ensure their message is effectively conveyed. Conversational adjustments are needed to ensure a collaborative interaction between speakers. This is commonly referred to as an act of "negotiation of meaning," which is defined as adjusting the communication between partners to overcome any barriers that may hinder understanding (as explained by Long in 1983). Gass (1997) also states that “negotiating meaning” is working together in order to prevent miscommunication and it refers to the interaction and its nature that is prone to difficulties. At these points of interaction, the speakers might need to rephrase or repeat their ideas or utterances to achieve a mutual understanding. They can also ask each other to clarify or restate their previous utterances. By employing strategies, they inform each other about the inception and termination points of conversational discontinuities which helps them to resolve and move on. As Long (1996) explained in the Interaction Hypothesis, negotiating meaning facilitates language acquisition because it helps learners to connect the input with their internal capacities with attention and forces the output to be more productive.

Investigating negotiation of meaning helps us to understand how communication is solved among speakers. From a second language acquisition (SLA) perspective, meaning negotiation constitutes opportunities for scaffolding which leads to promoting effective acquisition. Negotiation can unfold at any point during the class hour. Problem-based tasks offer students possible moments of meaning negotiation. All parties need to contribute to the problem to solve it by exchanging ideas and finding the best outcome or solution. By implementing these tasks in the classroom, teachers aim to get the conversation going and

push their students to a “communicative zone” that bears turn-taking and negotiation opportunities. In a problem-based task environment, students are required to comment and review each other’s ideas and solutions which will lead them to meaning negotiation. A task such as a podcast with an open-ended problem-solving part in which they are free to explore different voices and solutions combines what students are familiar with and their interests. By including such tasks in the curriculum, effective learning opportunities can be created both inside and outside of the classroom. Authenticity as part of the task components is also of great importance. Podcasts introduces students with authentic materials (Gromik, 2008). They can also help them improve their technological skills as they will use basic recording platforms and enhance their collaboration skills with peers.

Meaning negotiation offers a variety of domains to investigate from an SLA perspective. Researchers have conducted studies in various areas such as negotiation in young learners (Oliver, 1998, 2002, 2009), more recently in virtual realities (Chen & Sevilla-Pavón, 2023), between low-proficiency students (Lázaro & Azpilicueta, 2015; Shibata, 2022), in information-gap tasks (Hartono & Ihsan, 2016), in English as an International Language settings (Abdullah, 2011), how negotiation differs from online to face-to-face interactions (Lee, 2001), in video-conferencing (van Der Zwaard & Bannink, 2016, 2018; Tecedor, 2023), multimodality in NoM (Canals, 2021; Lee et al., 2019; Satar, 2015) and in online text-based communication (Akayoğlu & Seferoğlu, 2006; Shekary & Tahririan, 2006). With the proliferation of online classes and courses in recent years, it is beneficial to turn to online-mediated interaction and contribute to the literature by investigating online meaning-making moves of learners. By using problem-based tasks such as making podcasts of discussing certain topics, students are encouraged to exchange ideas.

Statement of the Problem

Meaning negotiation is an opportunistic exchange carried out within a conversation in which second language learners can produce modified input and, in return, turn it into output. However, it is often overlooked in language classes, although it was highlighted by

researchers in this field before (Gass, 1997; Long, 1983; Pica & Doughty, 1985) that negotiation of meaning is beneficial for both individual improvement and group dynamics in interactional tasks. For a negotiation process to be helpful in a language learner's second language (L2), direct feedback on their outputs is often needed, making them pay attention to the form or meaning (Gass, 1997). Meaning output has been associated with the Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1980) which has significantly contributed to our understanding of language learning processes. A central element of the Interaction Hypothesis is its focus on negotiating meaning in communicative interactions. During these exchanges, learners and their interlocutors engage collaboratively to address breakdowns in communication, utilizing strategies like seeking clarification, confirming understanding, and checking for comprehension. This not only improves comprehension but also nurtures an environment that facilitates language development.

Some ubiquitous negotiation of meaning and assistance strategies explained by both Long (1980) and Foster and Doha (2005) are comprehension checks, clarification checks, confirmation checks, co-construction, repetitions, and self/other corrections. These communication strategies help learners to solve problems and continue with the interaction. As Tarone (1981) puts it, communicational devices are used in a joint interactional function, meaning it happens between the parties. When learning a language, the ability to speak is crucial as it demonstrates that the learner can use the language for communication. However, language classes may not always effectively teach students how to use certain language devices or not include them completely in their lesson planning. This study emphasizes the significance of such strategies and how students utilize them to establish their understanding through active participation in negotiating meaning collaboratively.

In addressing the challenges faced by EFL learners regarding strategy training, an avenue worth exploring is the integration of technology into language classes. Digital tools and online platforms present a valuable opportunity to supplement traditional teaching methods. Incorporating interactive language learning applications, virtual language

exchange programs, and multimedia resources can offer learners a dynamic and engaging environment. These technological resources not only cater to diverse learning styles but also provide instant feedback, allowing students to track their progress in real-time. Moreover, online platforms can facilitate collaborative learning experiences, enabling students to practice language strategies in virtual, global contexts. By embracing technology, language classes can transcend the limitations of traditional instruction, offering a more immersive and interactive approach to language learning that aligns with the digital era in which we live.

Regarding the Turkish context, EFL learners are found to be lacking strategy training in L2 communication and resorting to only a limited number of strategies (Uztosun & Erten, 2014). This gap in strategy utilization could potentially hinder their proficiency in navigating real-life communication situations. As language is a dynamic and context-dependent skill, incorporating a diverse range of language devices becomes paramount for learners to express themselves accurately and comprehensively. In addressing the deficiencies in strategy training in this context, it is imperative to underscore the pivotal role of teacher training programs. Educators serve as the linchpin in shaping the language learning experience, and their proficiency in imparting a diverse set of language strategies is paramount. Ongoing professional development programs can empower teachers with the necessary tools and methodologies to effectively integrate comprehensive strategy training into their curricula. This not only involves familiarizing teachers with the latest pedagogical approaches but also equipping them with practical techniques to engage learners in diverse language activities. By investing in the continuous development of language instructors, educational institutions can ensure that teachers are well-prepared to guide learners in utilizing a rich repertoire of communication strategies in meaning-making, thereby fostering a more robust and adaptive language learning environment.

The study sheds light on the importance of incorporating comprehensive strategy training in language curricula, encouraging educators to integrate practical exercises that

promote the effective use of various communication tools. By addressing this gap, language learners can not only enhance their ability to engage in meaningful conversations but also cultivate a more nuanced and versatile command of the language. For that reason, the research underlines the importance of strategy training for Turkish EFL students and aims for educators to create and implement different online tasks oriented to create opportunities for meaning negotiation and employ meaning-based teaching trajectories in their classes. Finally, this study is expected to contribute to the growing body of literature and meet the need for further studies in this field.

Aim and Significance of the Study

The primary objective of this study is to delve into the dynamics of how EFL students engage in meaning negotiation when tasked with problem-based assignments within the realm of online learning. The focus extends beyond a mere examination of the phenomenon; the study aims to discern recurring themes in the negotiation of meaning, providing valuable insights into how students navigate communicative challenges in a virtual environment. By undertaking this investigation, the research endeavors to unravel the strategies employed by EFL students to surmount breakdowns in communication, shedding light on their thought processes and problem-solving approaches.

Beyond its intrinsic academic curiosity, this study carries practical implications for language educators. An important facet is the potential for EFL teachers to glean insights from the findings, realizing that negotiation of meaning is a pervasive and adaptive strategy among students. Understanding this aspect is crucial, as it not only informs educators about the learning behaviors of their students but also underscores the importance of incorporating explicit training in these negotiation strategies into language instruction. Consequently, EFL teachers can leverage the study's outcomes to enhance their pedagogical approaches. Implementing these identified strategies in the classroom setting holds the promise of not only improving students' language proficiency but also honing their speaking and negotiation skills. Moreover, it contributes to the development of robust

communicational abilities in the target language, aligning with the broader goal of preparing students for effective communication in diverse linguistic contexts. Ultimately, this study stands as a bridge between theoretical understanding and practical application, offering valuable insights that can positively impact language education strategies and outcomes.

An area of the literature focuses on the differences in meaning negotiation between face-to-face and online-mediated interaction. Studies (e.g., van der Zwaards & Bannick, 2019; Yüksel & İnan, 2014) reveal that language students refrain from constructing meaning when they complete oral tasks in real life in contrast to online interaction where they negotiate meaning much more. The opposite of the phenomenon is still not documented by any study known by the researcher. The type of online might be a prerequisite in this context. The study, therefore, implements an online oral collaborative problem-based task in order to encourage EFL students to negotiate and construct meaning.

The studies of NoM in a Turkish context (e.g., Arpacı-Somuncu, 2016; Loewen & Gönülal, 2014; Uztosun & Erten, 2014; Yaman & Özcan, 2014; Yüksel & İnan, 2014) are somewhat scarce and the orientation of some are not necessarily on how EFL students negotiate meaning. The study aims to approach and add to the literature in this area. There is also a gap in the literature investigating the negotiation of meaning moves employed by Turkish EFL learners while doing online-mediated problem-based tasks. By investigating the students' moves, we can comprehend better how we can make the most of this interactional behavior in classes, enhance learners' L2 acquisition with appropriate online tasks, find recurring themes or functions of meaning negotiation to diversify between different types of negotiation of meaning moves, and raise awareness of the importance of strategy training in EFL lessons, especially in Turkish contexts. The study provides a different perspective on this subject by being conducted on Turkish EFL students, in an online environment, and employing a problem-based task.

Research Questions

RQ1.: Do Turkish EFL students negotiate meaning in an online problem-solving task?

RQ2.: What types of negotiation of meaning do Turkish EFL students use in an online problem-based task?

RQ2.1.: How are the negotiation of meaning types employed by the learners distributed among pairs?

RQ3.: Are there any patterns regarding the negotiation of meaning moves employed by Turkish EFL students?

Assumptions

Some assumptions regarding the findings of this study can be made beforehand.

1. The students will construct meaning collaboratively in the problem-based tasks and assist each other in meaning-making when they indicate misunderstandings.
2. The students will make use of different types of negotiation of meaning moves.
3. Implemented problem-based task will encourage students to talk about the problem and come up with ways to solve it.
4. The data complied with the language learners will have adequate moves to make assumptions on the most common negotiation moves and thematical patterns.
5. The findings of the study will be mostly in line with the findings of older studies with some differences due to being conducted in a Turkish context.
6. The findings of the study will be useful for future strategy training curriculum plans by explaining how learners make use of communication strategies.

Limitations

The research investigation was carried out with a relatively modest cohort, comprising 20 participants actively engaged in online tasks. While the sample size might be considered limited in terms of statistical generalizability, it is essential to recognize the specific context in which the study was conducted. The focus on EFL classes within a Turkish context adds a unique dimension to the research, shedding light on the intricacies of language acquisition within the online learning environment. Consequently, the findings may not be universally or locally applicable, yet they offer valuable insights into a specific educational setting.

Despite the limited generalizability, the significance of this study lies in its contribution to the expanding body of research on SLA. By approaching the topic from a distinct perspective, the study provides nuanced observations that enrich the existing literature. This nuanced perspective not only enhances our understanding of language acquisition but also prompts further exploration into the dynamics of online language learning, an area that has become increasingly relevant in contemporary educational landscapes.

Coding processes of NoM types can be problematic as contextualized flexibility can alter decision processes (Lázaro-Ibarrola & Azpilicueta-Martinez, 2022). Therefore, the context and underlying messages need to be addressed and accounted for in order to eliminate diversions. Preliminary principles for coding and identification steps might help to avoid confusion. The creditability of coding is secured by having a second rater to code an amount of transcribed data and calculate inter-rater reliability.

The dataset utilized in this study consists of transcribed conversations, a method commonly employed in linguistic research to analyze spoken interactions. However, it is crucial to acknowledge the inherent limitations associated with the transcription process. Achieving perfect transcription is an elusive goal, and the quality of transcriptions is inevitably influenced by the subjectivity of the person undertaking the task. Variability in

interpretation, linguistic nuances, and context may introduce some degree of subjectivity into the transcribed data, emphasizing the importance of cautious interpretation.

The study's reliance on online settings introduces a layer of complexity to the research on discourse and conversation. Online environments are susceptible to technical issues and disruptions throughout interactions, potentially compromising the integrity of the collected data. Factors such as internet connectivity or other technical glitches may have interfered with the clarity and coherence of the discourse produced by speakers. This introduces a potential risk to the authenticity and fidelity of the conversation in the target language, highlighting the need for researchers to exercise prudence and consider the potential impact of technical challenges on the overall reliability of the study's findings. Despite these challenges, acknowledging and addressing the limitations associated with online data collection contributes to a more transparent and nuanced interpretation of the study's results.

Even though some cases of avoidance of NoM were present and included in the analysis part of the study, their occurrences cannot be fully justified since there could be many reasons behind them. Additionally, it is a hard and complex job to pinpoint an exact and concrete reason because investigating the conversation only within one perspective is not sufficient and reliable enough to make assumptions about them. Therefore, structured interviews with the participants who avoided negotiation can shed some light and give objective explanations from their perspective.

Definitions

Problem-based task: Any task with an element of problem intertwined within that aims at preparing the students to solve real-life troubles and to enable them to construct a flexible base of reviewing difficulties and dilemmas (Barrows & Kelson, 1995).

Negotiation of meaning: The processes in which the interaction is modified between two or more interactional partners in order to overcome or resolve communication breakdowns (Long, 1983).

Comprehension check: A type of negotiation of meaning move in which the listener checks with the other party by asking wh- and tag questions or explicitly shows misunderstanding (Long, 1980).

Clarification request: A type of negotiation of meaning move in which the listener responds with questions such as "What is this?" or "What do you mean?" in order to understand the incomprehensible input constructed by the other party (Long, 1980).

Confirmation check: It efers to checking for confirmation strategies such as repeating one's utterance in whole or partially to ensure what the listener heard before is correct (Long, 1980).

Strategy training: A type of explicit training in language learning strategies to empower learners to enhance their language acquisition process and become more self-sufficient and competent in their language learning endeavors (Cohen, 2003)

Chapter 2

Theoretical Basis of Research and Literature Review

Problem-Based Learning Using Online Tasks

Whether it is mandatory or not, online education is still in demand today with the emergence of new educational needs and possibilities. Online interaction is not a new form of communication and it still serves as a common educational proxy. Moreover, the studies regarding the area are relevant in line with today's events and expectations. Many studies find that if it is implemented right, online education and interaction may be fruitful in terms of contribution and interactional opportunities between students. It provides equal participation (Kelm, 1992), allows each party to have enough time to process (therefore promoting self-paced learning) the information (Watschauer, 1996), and increases the conversation language's complexity (Kern, 1995). As this study's setting is online classes, it is important to touch upon the related research to fully comprehend the situation.

Face-to-face communication and online communication exhibit notable differences across various dimensions. In face-to-face interactions, the richness of non-verbal cues, including facial expressions, body language, and eye contact, contributes significantly to understanding emotions and conveying nuances in the message. Immediate feedback is inherent in these interactions, allowing for real-time adjustments to the conversation. The shared physical environment enhances contextual understanding. Social cues such as tone of voice play a crucial role in conveying meaning. In contrast, online communication, often lacking many non-verbal cues, relies on digital substitutes like emoticons and emojis. Feedback in digital communication may experience delays, and participants may be physically distant, impacting contextual understanding. The multitasking nature of online communication, coupled with the permanence of written records, introduces challenges such as divided attention and concerns about privacy. Anonymity in the online realm may lead to disinhibition, affecting the tone and content of communication. The choice between face-to-face and online communication depends on context, purpose, and individual

preferences, as each mode offers unique opportunities and challenges for effective interaction.

The task type used in the online medium makes a difference in the use of negotiation (Smith, 2003). Therefore, while some types of tasks would benefit from more interaction, others would not be able to produce more meaning-making processes. As an example, one study from Yüksel and İnan (2014) suggests that their online jigsaw tasks were found to be successful in eliciting more meaning negotiation sequences. In foreign language classes, language teachers aim to encourage students to both express themselves in the target language freely and initiate conversations with their peers to exchange in L2. Problem-based tasks can be an effective way to achieve these communicative goals because they constitute a great chance to produce a substantial amount of meaning negotiation in a classroom setting (Foster, 1998). Language acquisition is facilitated by the negotiation of meaning and language production through negotiated interactions while doing tasks and activities that are meaningful (Anderson, 2000; as cited in Arslanyilmaz, 2012). Other similar approaches that follow similar principles are task-based learning (Willis, 1996; Ellis, 2003) and content-based learning (Garner & Borg, 2005). Therefore, the study uses a task-based learning approach with the inclusion of problem-solving tasks in order to create appropriate and beneficial opportunities for meaning negotiation.

Tasks that require problem-solving skills are unique in an aspect that they focus on teaching language by promoting problem-solving skills while using authentic and open-ended tasks. The problems implemented in these tasks do not have fixed solutions, allowing students to generate their ideas and enhance their language competencies by practicing their communicative skills in a meaningful context. When students work collaboratively (pair or group work) to solve a given problem, the resulting discussion can lead to negotiation of meaning. As a result, students are encouraged to produce authentic language where language production serves as a means rather than an end in itself. Using a task-based approach encourages meaning negotiation through "meaning-focused" and

"communicative" task completion activities and provides students an opportunity to practice language extensively in a meaningful context (Doughty & Long, 2003).

Negotiation of Meaning

The Interaction Hypothesis (IH) (Long, 1983) and output hypothesis (Swain, 1985) were two influential theories that have significantly affected the second language acquisition field. At the core of the Interaction Hypothesis lies the concept of "comprehensible input" (as introduced by Stephen Krashen). Long builds upon this idea by asserting that the effectiveness of comprehensible input is heightened through interaction. Learners, when exposed to language just beyond their current proficiency level, are encouraged to actively engage in conversations, leading to a deeper understanding and internalization of linguistic structures. The hypothesis posits that language input during interactions is often modified to cater to the learners' linguistic needs. Teachers, peers, or native speakers play an active role in scaffolding the learning experience, simplifying language, or repeating information to enhance understanding. These modifications serve as a bridge, assisting learners in transitioning from their current proficiency to a more advanced level. Crucially, the value of learners producing modified output during interactions is greater than other aspects of input (Wang & Castro, 2010). This entails experimentation with language, and the subsequent feedback from interlocutors contributes to the refinement of linguistic forms. Learners not only receive guidance but also witness model language use, facilitating the internalization of more advanced structures. The theoretical underpinnings of the IH have profound implications for language teaching methodologies. Interactive activities, such as pair and group work, discussions, and role-plays, are advocated to provide learners with ample opportunities for meaningful communication. Instructors are encouraged to prioritize real communication over isolated language drills, fostering an environment that nurtures practical language use.

A substantial amount of work has demonstrated that L2 learners can negotiate meaning when they engage in conversation. This process can also help L2 learners identify

errors in their speech and encourage them to improve their language output. Many studies (e.g., Foster & Doha, 2005; Gass & Varonis, 1985; Lee, 2001; Long, 1980; Pica, Kanagy, & Falodun, 1993; Scarcella & Higa, 1981) in the past have already highlighted the importance of language interaction and negotiation in acquiring and developing a second language. Long (1980) states that negotiation of meaning necessitates altering the linguistic exchange between parties to resolve communication barriers. Studies on NNS-NNS discourse reveal a great amount of modified interaction within the conversation which Long (1983) believes to be one of the fundamental aspects of second language acquisition which brings us to the notion of competence.

Interactional competence encompasses an individual's adeptness in navigating social interactions with a keen understanding of the cultural and contextual intricacies that shape communicative exchanges. Going beyond mere linguistic proficiency, this competence involves the skills necessary to engage effectively in diverse social contexts. One crucial component of interactional competence is the ability to negotiate meaning, wherein individuals collaboratively work to resolve communication breakdowns and ensure a shared understanding. Furthermore, interactional competence extends to interpreting and appropriately responding to non-verbal cues, understanding social dynamics, and employing pragmatic strategies that are contextually relevant. This skill set becomes particularly significant in multicultural settings, where individuals must navigate various cultural norms to foster smooth and meaningful interactions. In the realm of language acquisition, the development of interactional competence is integral to achieving communicative proficiency, emphasizing not only the conveyance of linguistic meaning but also engagement in socially appropriate and culturally sensitive exchanges. Whether in everyday conversations, professional interactions, or cross-cultural communication, interactional competence, coupled with negotiation of meaning, plays a pivotal role in cultivating positive relationships and ensuring successful communication across diverse social landscapes. Additionally, teaching methods that incorporate interactive activities

have a greater impact on developing language learners' speaking skills (Luan and Sappathy, 2011).

Meaning negotiation can be carried out with the help of various negotiation strategies whenever interaction takes place. These strategies can be considered as a part of learners' comptences. Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) define strategic competence as the "knowledge of communication strategies and how to use them" (p. 26). Their definition of strategic competence includes interactional strategies which they describe as "cooperative act of strategy use" (p. 26). They discuss and categorize a couple of meaning negotiation strategies under the scope of interactional strategies. They propose implementing strategy training as a part of the syllabi by raising awareness on how to construct meaning and encouraging taking risks in language output.

How negotiation of meaning moves are performed does not necessarily depend on a person's demographics. Several studies (e.g., Bitchener, 2004; Hartono & Ihsan, 2016; Lázaro & Azpilicueta, 2015; Shibata, 2022) have shown that language learners can communicate effectively by negotiating meaning, regardless of their language proficiency level and L1 background. In such situations, students rely on their sociolinguistic skills to address communication breakdowns, rather than solely relying on their proficiency. High-proficient and low-proficient learners may use different strategies to negotiate meaning, even though language mastery may not be a prerequisite for meaning-making. Additionally, over several years, Oliver conducted a series of research in 1998, 2002, and 2009 that yielded valuable insights into the interactions and meaning negotiations between children in NNS-NNS and NNS-NS pairs. These studies have demonstrated that children of all ages possess the ability to participate in meaning negotiations. Thus, it can be emphasized that age must not be regarded as a decisive factor in the ability of language learners to construct meaning collaboratively.

The concept of negotiation for meaning involves a cooperative exchange that allows all interacting participants to develop a shared understanding while resolving

communication breakdowns. Meaning-making is a joint effort (Tarone, 1981), and learners play an active role in creating meaning (Pica, Kanagy & Falodun, 1993). Moreover, to participate in a NoM, students need to reconstruct their utterances with “additional input and useful feedback” (Richard & Schmidt, 2013, p. 290). This negotiation process is believed to help learners turn incomprehensible information into something more understandable (Varonis & Gass, 1985). According to Deen and van Hout (1997), negotiating for meaning during a conversation is a secondary aspect that does not take center stage. It can be likened to a "pushdown" interruption that momentarily halts the flow of the conversation until the communication issue is resolved (Varonis & Gass, 1985). Negotiation of meaning is considered to be the distinguishing factor between interactive and non-interactive input and it is critical for language acquisition (Gass & Varonis, 1994). Therefore, if interaction is indeed essential, as many believe, negotiating for meaning becomes the most crucial aspect of the language learning process.

Politeness theory provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how individuals manage interpersonal communication to maintain positive social relationships. At its core is the concept of "face," which represents an individual's positive social value or self-esteem. Politeness Theory posits that communication involves a constant negotiation to avoid or mitigate face-threatening acts (FTAs), which are actions or utterances that may challenge someone's positive or negative face (Brown & Levinson, 1987). It's essential to note that cultural variability influences the choice of politeness strategies, as different cultures may have distinct norms regarding what is considered polite or impolite. Hiraga and Turner (1996) indicated that the predominant illocutionary force, such as criticism, suggestion, or request, may be expected to threaten both the positive and negative face of the students.

Politeness Theory and the negotiation of meaning are interconnected concepts within the realm of communication, particularly evident in second language acquisition and intercultural communication. Both highlight the collaborative nature of effective

communication, emphasizing the joint effort required to resolve potential breakdowns and maintain positive social relationships. In the negotiation of meaning, learners, and interlocutors employ various strategies to ensure mutual understanding. This process shares common ground with Politeness Theory, where strategies such as positive and negative politeness are utilized to navigate potential face-threatening acts and preserve interpersonal harmony. The indirect nature of both negotiation of meaning and politeness strategies is notable, as learners may use indirect language to seek clarification, while politeness strategies often involve deference and indirectness to save face. Additionally, the influence of cultural norms on both concepts underscores the importance of understanding cultural nuances in effective communication. In language learning environments, the integration of negotiation of meaning and politeness contributes to the development of sociocultural and pragmatic competence, empowering learners not only with linguistic skills but also with the ability to navigate social dynamics appropriately. Overall, these interconnected concepts offer valuable insights into the collaborative and culturally influenced nature of communication processes.

Finally, Varonis and Gass' (1985) model for negotiation defines a sequence of discourse as the two parts of a negotiation routine; trigger and resolution. Resolution sequences include the following; an indicator (I), a response (R), and in some instances, a reaction to response (RR). Triggers include the part of an utterance that is seen as problematic or misunderstood as they initiate the sequence of the negotiation process. Indicators precede the triggers as the hearer implies some problems or a non-understanding they have with the trigger. They can be in the form of various primes of meaning negotiation. Responses acknowledge the problem that is implied in the indicator and include the utterances performed in order to solve the problem. Reactions to responses are not necessarily mandatory to be included in the resolution part as the parties may not choose to respond to the responses. However, they are beneficial as they indicate whether the resolution, and therefore the negotiation sequence, has terminated successfully and all

parties have come to a mutual understanding or it failed to resolve the problem and another response is needed. This model provides negotiation sequences with a clear definition from the starting point to the end. Identifying triggers in interactions plays an important role in determining which sequences include negotiation and helps to eliminate the others in the discourse data. After explaining the negotiation of meaning and how it unfolds in an interaction, we can turn to different types of meaning negotiation strategies described by previous studies.

Types of Meaning Negotiation Strategies

Several studies have delved into the various types and strategies of negotiation, including those presented by Long (1985), Foster and Doha (2005), Pica and Doughty (1985), and Oliver (1998). Long coined the term "three Cs" to describe these methods, which are comprised of comprehension and confirmation checks, and clarification requests.

Comprehension Checks: This type of meaning negotiation is used to check whether the speaker's previous turn has been conveyed to the other party and has been understood. Wh- and tag questions are also among the most common comprehension checks. Long (1980) argues that such checks are employed to determine if the other interlocutor has received the message or has a problem understanding the message.

Source: Kim (2017)

A: It’s called Top Twenty.

B: **Do you know what Top Twenty is?** (*Comprehension check)*

A: I’m not quite sure.

Confirmation Checks: Checking for confirmation is employed when an interlocutor repeats all or a part of what the other party has said to make sure that they heard it correctly (Long, 1980). They are usually created by using a short and rising intonation, made by the listener as soon as the speaker completes a turn or when the part for which you are asked to confirm is finished, designed to confirm to the other receiver that what is said by the speaker is correctly understood or heard correctly. For example, if the subsequent turn is

“The last time I saw my mother, she was sick.”, one can ask, “She was sick?” in order to confirm. This question can be given as an example of a confirmation check. Such checks are always made in the form of questions with a high intonation and include repetition of some or all of the received message (Long, 1980). In response, short answers, which are often comprehension checks, can be given by the first speaker. In some cases, confirmation checks do not signal a breakdown. They might be employed to buy time for the next turn or show disbelief and amazement regarding the preceding information (Foster & Ohta, 2005).

Source: Gass & Selinker (1994)

NNS1: When can you go to visit me?

NNS2: **Visit?** *(Confirmation check)*

Clarification Request: Speakers might request clarification when the input is incomprehensible or complex. Clarification requests might interrupt the flow of the conversation or shift the focus to another topic. Utterances such as “What do you mean?” and “What is that called?” can be given as examples. Clarification requests usually consist of direct questions asked to the other party. Still, they can be created with different types of questions, as the other party is asked to provide new information or to explain the information that has already been given. Unlike confirmation checks, the speaker does not know and does not make any assumptions about whether the listener understands or hears what they are saying (Long, 1980).

Source: Oliver (1998)

NNS: A little line in the leave.

NS: **A what?** *(Clarification request)*

Long’s three Cs are often argued to be the foundation when types of negotiation of meaning are listed. However, as the number of research on the subject has proliferated since then, many more have been found that cannot be categorized simply by these three and according to the findings of their 2005 paper, Foster and Doha challenged the

commonly held notion that meaning negotiation is solely comprised of three Cs. Negotiation extended above solving breakdowns to assitance in L2. Their research revealed that speakers employed a range of assistance startegies that did not align well with the traditional three Cs. To account for these additional strategies, they introduced co-construction, other-correction, self-correction, and continuers.

Co-construction: Collaboratively creating a spoken sentence is called co-construction, where multiple people contribute their ideas and thoughts. This occurs when one speaker assists the other by carrying on or supplying the required information to complete their sentence. This assisting strategy encourages language learners to reassess and improve their language skills by participating in the formation of spoken sentences they may not be able to construct independently. Co-construction is similar to the sociocultural approach to SLA in that it involves scaffolding and provides opportunities for the zone of proximal development (Foster & Doha, 2005).

Example taken from the research data

01 ABR: organic farming is u:sing only

02 ABR: uhh::

03 ABR: the resources at the moment

04 ABR: not using

05 *(2.0)*

06 ABR: hmm:

07 BAD: **<u>ch</u>emicals an:d pesticides** *(co-construction)*

08 ABR: yeah

Self- and other-correction: Correction involves rectifying mistakes in both the linguistic and semantic aspects of language. A speaker reconstructs the erroneous sentence by repeating it in the correct form or explicitly telling how to correct the mistake. It can be executed either by the speaker or by others during their turn. Self-correction is when the speaker takes the initiative to repair their error independently, while other-correction is

initiated by someone else. Some researchers (e.g., Schegloff et al., 1977; Foster & Doha, 2005) have pointed out that self-correction is more common than other-correction and the latter even is seen as discouraging by speakers, therefore it is avoided.

Example taken from the research data

01 IBR: i did an internship in spain

02 IBR: two times:

03 (1.7)

04 IBR: **[twice]** *(self-correction)*

05 FIL: **[twice]** *(other-correction)*

Continuers: A "continuer" is employed when one person encourages another to continue speaking, demonstrating a genuine interest in hearing more about their thoughts or experiences. This type of meaning negotiation not only keeps the conversation flowing but also provides the speaker with an opportunity to further elaborate on their ideas. In language learning, utilizing continuers creates a nurturing environment that fosters confidence and motivates learners to express themselves more freely in the target language. Below is an example of a continuer from the same study.

Source: Foster & Doha (2005)

A: I wasn't so fat before I came to England.

B: Fat? (*Continuer)*

A: Yeah, but now I eat a lot of bread.

Pica and Doughty (1985) suggest that "repetitions" can foster meaning-making practices and mutual comprehension among speakers. Typically, this practice involves reiterating previous statements to confirm understanding and dispel any confusion. This approach is commonly employed when a speaker suspects that their message may not be fully comprehensible to their audience. Such instances of repetitions are frequently observed in data as self-repetitions. Repetitions can be partial or expanded according to the length of the discourse. If a speaker repeats a small part of the discourse, it is partial

repetition and if they repeat with adding new information to the discourse, it becomes expanded repetition. Expanded repetition helps interlocutors to add in their ideas while constructing meaning collaboratively.

Source: Oliver (1998)

A: There was a sun.

B: **Sun?** (*Partial other-repetition)*

A: Up the table.

A: **Up on the eating table.** *(Expanded self-repetition)*

Meaning Negotiation Research in the Literature

Meaning negotiation research covers a vast range of areas to study, including differences between young and adult learners, the conversations between non-native speakers (NNSs) and native speakers (NSs) as well as NNS-NNS pairings, low-proficiency learners to high-proficiency learners, and so on. Since meaning-making can occur in any interaction, researchers have been able to study a variety of contexts, resulting in a literature that spans different areas of research.

In a case study conducted by Shibata in 2022, two Japanese EFL learners at a low-intermediate level were observed during a recorded Zoom conversation. The conversation was transcribed using both an online tool and the researcher. The primary focus of the analysis was on their spoken language, with para-linguistic features such as tone and speed being excluded. However, upon closer examination, it was discovered that both participants, Nami and Ami, frequently altered their tone to convey emotions and uncertainty in their language. Nami also employed self-repetition or repair techniques. Interestingly, both participants utilized changes in tone as confirmation checks, skillfully employing para-linguistic elements to negotiate meaning. They provided and received ample support by using clarification requests and confirmation checks to ensure mutual understanding.

Regarding the low-proficient students, Lázaro and Azpilicueta (2015) also investigated 16 EFL young learners with different L1s and backgrounds in terms of their

capability of meaning negotiation. The study concluded that the children were able to achieve negotiation even though they were not very proficient in the language. They also employed the main interaction strategies reported in some previous studies but it was seen that they neglected comprehension checks which means that they didn't check if their partner(s) understood them or not. The study also adds that the children negotiated meaning much less than adults and children in L2 environments which the authors explain as the interference of low proficiency levels of the children. As a final finding, it was revealed that despite limited L2, children can cooperate linguistically to negotiate meaning.

Oliver (1998, 2002) has been a leading figure in NoM practices in child talk thanks to her studies regarding children's NNS and Ns interactions. In 2009, she conducted a study on how young learners use language during interactional tasks, specifically investigating whether they negotiate meaning. The study involved 32 children, eight of whom were native speakers and 24 were non-native speakers. The children were given tasks such as "describe and draw" and jigsaws, and their conversations were recorded and transcribed orthographically to analyze negotiation patterns. The study found that young learners do indeed negotiate meaning, and the percentages of meaning negotiation types were similar to those found in older studies (1998 and 2002). This suggests that there is little difference in negotiation patterns based on age. However, the study also found that young learners use comprehension checks less frequently than adult learners, which may be attributed to their egocentric nature. Additionally, the study notes that young learners tend to focus more on themselves rather than others. Finally, the study found that non-native speaker and non-native speaker pairings had more opportunities to negotiate meaning than native speaker and non-native speaker pairings.

Adding to research on NoM in child interactions, Lázaro-Ibarrola and Azpilicueta-Martinez (2022) found that children EFL learners negotiated meaning at similar rates as adults in EFL courses. They studied 20 children and 14 adults, who shared Spanish as their first language, in order to check for dissimilarities and challenge earlier studies' findings by

implementing the same tasks for both groups. Differences between the age groups were that children utilized clarification checks for wider purposes and adults made use of confirmation checks more than children. The children were able to produce more meaningful output as a result of negotiation while adults struggled more in a meaningful outcome. While children repeated themselves more, adults repeated other's utterances more frequently. In conclusion, the study adds to the research of interactional-based SLA and suggests that more studies are needed for a better understanding of how age affects meaning-making.

To find if there was a significant difference in meaning negotiation between online and face-to-face interaction, Lee (2001) studied intermediate learners (n=40) of English. The learners joined in discussion with each other through using an online chatroom. The researcher provided them with everyday topics to pick from. The study concluded that learners use the same variety of negotiation devices in online-mediated tasks that they already employ in their face-to-face interactions. The study also implies that the employment of such negotiation practices by incorporating online into classroom activities might improve learners' language skills and promote their L2 learning.

In contrast to Lee (2001), Fernández-García and Martínez-Arbelaiz (2002) found that some types of negotiation devices differentiated between oral and online written conversation. Their sample was twenty-eight university students learning Spanish and they were recorded doing content questions in four different groups. Their major tendency to solve breakdowns was switching to their L1 which most of the time enabled them to convey meaning successfully. The researchers concluded that while utilizing native language during conversation may assist learners in promptly getting back on track, it may not necessarily help them to enhance their foreign language abilities. At this point, it is highlighted that it is important to investigate whether utilizing the first language is a typical aspect of foreign language learning, particularly when learners share the same native language, or if there are other factors at play. Furthermore, the forms of cues employed in

digital communication differed from those utilized in face-to-face communication. Typically, the students expressed communication breakdowns by stating that they did not comprehend using a formula they were taught in class. Regarding other indicators, they were either absent or exceedingly rare.

In her 2006 research, Mariotti discovered an intriguing insight. The students she studied were actively engaged in negotiating meaning during class time. However, when pair-work tasks were introduced and the teaching stopped, the preference for negotiation significantly decreased, or they struggled to make sense of the material. It was observed that when the interaction was between the teacher and student, meaning negotiation was more prevalent. However, when the interaction was between students, they tended to neglect meaning negotiation. The study emphasizes the need for teachers to receive specific training to help them tap into their students' potential and guide them in negotiating meaning and using negotiation tools.

Arslanyilmaz and Pedersen (2010) conducted research using subtitled videos to increase task familiarity of the students and encourage them to engage in meaning-making sequences. The study involved 20 non-native English speakers, with the experimental group being given subtitled videos to aid their online tasks. Students completed four tasks with or without subtitles in a task-based language teaching environment. The results showed that having subtitles shifted the students' focus from form to meaning, resulting in more opportunities for meaning negotiation. The experimental group participated in meaning-making sequences three times more than the control group. Then, it can be concluded that increasing task familiarity among learners holds the potential for more NoM moves and, consequently, language advancement.

van der Zwaard and Bannink conducted NoM research in online video conferences. Their 2014 study investigated two different interactions, one over video-conferencing and the other over a chat setting, to find if one constituted more possible NoM moves. There were fewer moves of negotiation in video-conferencing although it had more non-

understandings. Two years later, van der Zwaard and Bannink (2016) looked at the interactional patterns in NoM sequences in video conferences of native and non-native pairing. They presented several possible paths that the interlocutors may pursue once the sequence is started by a more proficient speaker. In encounters among native and non-native speakers, avoiding misunderstandings and keeping others from entering meaning negotiations appeared to be more prevalent. In conclusion, the study showed that participants might avoid using meaning-making strategies despite communication breakdowns.

In the Turkish context, Yüksel & İnan (2014) investigated the use of NoM strategies by Turkish EFL students in both face-to-face and synchronous computer-mediated interactions. One strength of the study was its number of participants. They implemented two jigsaw tasks for 32 dyads (n=64) of intermediate-level Turkish EFL students. Every participant completed two different jigsaws with a different partner both face-to-face (F2F) and online. Their sessions were recorded and then analyzed. They concluded that students employed more NoM strategies in face-to-face interactions than computer-mediated ones. The most prevalent type of NoM was confirmation checks. Another finding of the study was that online tasks lasted longer and took more time to complete than F2F. However, this might be explained by the face-threatening nature of real-life communication.

In a study investigating the differences in oral communication strategies (CSs) used by 294 Turkish EFL students, Yaman and Özcan (2015) reported that one of the most common oral CS students employed was negotiation of meaning strategies. They implemented a data collection tool they developed, namely the Strategy Inventory of Oral Communication (SIOC). They concluded that the gender of the students had a greater impact on the differences than their language proficiency and suggested that the research task type may have been a determining factor in their strategy utilization. As a result, they advocate for more research on gender variations and how different tasks affect the frequency of using strategies. Finally, they proposed that students be educated in the use

of negotiation for meaning strategies in order to cope with communication breakdowns and fulfill their communicative goals.

This chapter elucidated the theoretical foundation of the study by presenting key theories, hypotheses, and studies of some researchers. Additionally, it provided a thorough review and explanation of relevant literature that aligns with the study's objective. The following chapter will outline the methodology and data analysis procedures, which will encompass coding types of NoM and the analysis of transcribed discourse from the participants.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Detailed information about the study's research methodology will be presented in this section. First, the research type and participants will be explained. Then, discourse analysis will be discussed briefly as the research methodology as well as the definition of discourse. Following that will be the procedure of data collection. The chapter will conclude by illustrating the analytic procedures employed to examine the data.

Research Design

This research adopts a mixed-method design in which both quantitative and qualitative data are collected and analyzed within the same study. A concurrent embedded strategy of mixed-method design is employed because it enables the researcher to collect both data at the same (Creswell & Clark, 2011). A mixed-method design has the benefit of achieving broader perspectives by using different methods and making concrete assumptions as a result (Creswell, 2012). The data of the study is analyzed quantitatively by using basic statics and then qualitatively by employing a discourse analytic approach.

Schegloff (1993) proposes that while conducting research employing discourse analysis, it is necessary to conduct a meticulous qualitative analysis that is before the quantitative analysis of discourse data. Such a sociocultural approach to the data places a high priority on qualitative research methodologies and pays particular focus to the contexts and participants in interactions (Foster & Ohta, 2005). Therefore, while analyzing data using discourse analysis, some quantification measures might help the researcher gain insight into the data to a certain extent that qualitative data will not be sufficient to do. For all the listed reasons above, in this study, both qualitative and quantitative data analysis are employed in order to make meaningful connections between each analysis. In the qualitative phase of the study, transcriptions of voice recordings are analyzed and cases of NoM are identified using a pre-defined modal. After all of the cases were transcribed, then they were coded into each type of NoM. Discourse analysis is utilized to identify certain

functions of NoM moves or reoccurring lexical items that lead pairs to negotiation. In the quantitative part of the study, all of the cases were counted and numerical comparisons between pairs and each NoM type were made regarding finding the most and least common type, as well as the distribution among pairs to make conclusions on a dyadic level.

Setting and Participants

The participants of this study are 20 preparatory school students at a Turkish state university learning English as a foreign language (EFL). All of the students were from the same level and section. The study selected participants by using a non-probability sampling framework that is purposive sampling. Purposive or judgmental sampling is a non-random sampling technique that requires participants with pre-defined characteristics (Kumar, 2018). Because this study is designed to investigate the negotiation for meaning moves of Turkish EFL students, pre-defined requirements for participants are chosen to be within the same age group (18-20), to be from the same ethnic background (Turkish) and to have nearly the same language proficiency (intermediate). The students are expected to be intermediate (B1) speakers of English because they are enrolled in the intermediate classes of the preparatory school in which they are put according to the school's placement test before the start of the semester. Since the research participation is on a voluntary basis, the students were given consent forms that explained their voice recordings, which in fact are their podcast-creating task, would be used in the research before participating in the study. All students who participated in the study filled out their consent forms (see Appendix-B) online.

Data Collection

The data for this study was collected online from students' task homework when classes were being carried out online because of the Kahramanmaras earthquake that happened in February 2023. After receiving the Ethic Committee Approval, 2 preparatory school EFL teachers at a state university that is conveniently close to the researcher were reached out and details about the research were given. Then, each teacher assigned their

students an online task: making a podcast. Students were already familiar with podcasts as they were utilized in the classroom and were a part of the curriculum.

Podcasts were chosen because they allow students to interact with each other and exchange ideas in meaningful contexts (Rosell-Aguilar, 2013) and improve their English-speaking skills (Farangi et al. 2016; Koçak & Alagözlü, 2021). Creating a podcast in an EFL classroom is a student-centered approach that lets students identify issues in their peer groups as well as concerns about the world and create their communication channels to reach other students. Therefore, they have great potential to create opportunities for enabling students to negotiate meaning (Lee et al., 2008). This characteristic also allows for incorporating the dimension of problem-solving, elevaiting the complexity of the task.

Podcast themes and outlines were created by the researcher and shared with the teachers beforehand. The students were given a worksheet of details about the task. Below (Figure 1) is the homework sheet given to the students by their teachers ahead of recordings.

Figure 1

Podcast Homework Sheet

Creating Podcasts

Pair up and choose one of the themes to create a podcast addressing the problematic situations included in the descriptions. Record yourself while creating the podcast.

Podcast Theme 1: Living Abroad

Imagine you started a new life abroad, but you cannot seem to keep up. What could go wrong when you're living abroad? Discuss ways to assert yourself in the community and learn more about culture. How would you break the ice?

Podcast Theme 2: Sustainability and the Future

The world is running out of its resources at an alarming rate. While some scientists are looking for ways to colonize another planet, you think creating sustainable cities would help ease the problem. What do you do for sustainability? How would you create one? Which sustainable resources and practices would you put into use? Explain and discuss your ways to create a sustainable city.

Two themes for the podcast were provided and the preference of whether to choose was left to the students. Complementary questions were included to help students grasp the general idea of problem-solving and create a comfortable atmosphere for them to talk in, and additionally to improve their transition into the problem-solving part. The students recorded themselves doing the task and forwarded their recordings to the teacher as homework who forwarded them to the researcher for data collection. The researcher did not interact with students and was not present in the recording process to eliminate observer bias and interference that could damage the validity of data collection.

Discourse Analysis

Discourse has been a controversial term to define because it can be studied across a vast number of disciplines; hence each has its own definition. In that sense, there is no

universal agreement on what discourses are or how to analyze them. However, there is also no need to synthesize it into a fixed explanation. Different points of view make their own recommendations to define "discourse" and "discourse analysis" according to their own standards. With this in mind, it is beneficial to explore different definitions of what discourse is so that we can understand how every perspective intersects with each other.

Brown and Yule (1983) appointed discourse to convey much more than a sentence and extend beyond the grammatical aspects of language. For Halliday and Hasan (1989), discourse is highly context-dependent and longer compared to a sentence. Cook's (1992) definition adds that it is how one uses language in order to communicate. He also states that discourse might involve a few correctly constructed grammatical sentences. In a similar vein to Cook, Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) see discourse as a particular style of talking about and comprehending the world (or a particular feature of the universe). Hinkel and Fotos (2002) postulate that discourse is situated somewhere between two extremes. The first extreme is a context that has a few words such as the texts on signs and the second is where lengthy sentences are combined such as a book. They believe that a discourse goes between these two extremes.

Of all the definitions, two aspects can be agreed upon.

1) Discourse is highly rooted in communication because of its context-dependency.

2) Being grammatically correct and its length is not a prerequisite for an utterance to be discourse.

In this regard, this research explicates discourse as the spoken elements that constitute a conversation regardless of how long or grammatical it is. Now that a definition is given for discourse, we can turn to discourse analysis and how discourse is analyzed by using this methodology.

Lazaraton (2009) describes discourse analysis as a tool for deciphering real spoken, and in some instances written, conversation. For Prior and Talmy (2019), discourse analysis

is an eclectic, interdisciplinary set of methods for examining talk and written language. A study with a discourse analytic approach to talk data aims to pinpoint a precise connection between the debate and the more general problem or query under consideration. They also argue that one of the main objectives is to avoid assessing the speaker personally. In order to focus just on the conversation at this point, it will be beneficial for researchers working with talk data to try to leave aside what is known about the person.

The analysis usually focuses on spoken interaction rather than monolog chat and produces a rich, contextualized account of natural language use in a specific context and scenario. Although some researchers use vast corporas (i.e., previously recorded and transcribed conversations that are made public for further research) for their analysis, many studies in discourse analysis typically focus on a small number of speakers (Taylor, 2013).

Creating arguments from facts to assertions is another objective. Building on the similarities and differences between the facts and claims of prior researchers in the field will undoubtedly be advantageous. The following fundamental premise holds true despite this diversity: language can be examined for both its forms and social purposes (that is, as a social action rather than as an impersonal means of exchanging ideas and information).

The conclusions made within discourse analytic research are interpretations that are supported by an intricate data analysis process. This analytical strategy serves as the framework for generalization, revealing patterns in a large body of conversation or other language data. The inquiry has conclusively revealed the social meanings and language-related actions that are characteristic of a larger population and environment. It is important to note, however, that these meanings and practices do not entirely determine or forecast present or future interactions, practices, or circumstances. The underlying premise is that social life is extremely complex and emergent (Taylor, 2013).

Discourse analysis and interpretation of discourse might be perceived as hard because every interpretation we make might need to go through several revisions even if there is a framework. In addition, even ideas that are supported by evidence could be

dismissed while others are practiced and refined. Therefore, the researcher must keep an open mind about what they are observing and let the findings emerge from the data rather than imposing an a priori framework on the data for the analysis to be grounded (Lazaraton, 2019).

In this study, the coding of categories is also vital for the reliability and generalizability of study findings, as is the capability of researchers to implement the categories used in prior research. Maintaining the consistency and validity of research findings is crucial in ensuring the credibility of a study. One approach to achieving this is by utilizing interrater reliability scores, a statistical measure that determines the level of agreement between two or more raters or observers. Nonetheless, it is important to note that while interrater reliability scores enhance a study's internal consistency, they do not necessarily ensure that the results are generalizable to the wider population or other settings (Wooffitt, 2005). To accomplish this, clear definitions of coding categories must be provided with examples. The definitions frequently used for the coding of NoM moves are confirmation checks, clarification requests, and comprehension checks. However, this study employs a wide array of categories for a more precise coding process. All of these categories were explained in detail in Chapter 2. Dependability and confirmability issues (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) are addressed by explicating the procedures of how data is collected and analyzed.

Data Analysis

Steps to data analysis are as the following:

1. Transcribing the voice recordings
2. Listening to the data recordings repeatedly
3. Identifying cases of negotiation of meaning
4. Coding the identified cases
5. Creating tables for the distribution of cases using numerical data
6. Analysis for each cases on a discourse level

Each recording was transcribed by the researcher in accordance with Jefferson's (2004) transcription (see Appendix A). Potter (2012) indicates that Jefferson's transcription notion "captures features of delivery that are oriented to by participants – overlap, volume, prosody – in a way that makes them visible on the page" (p. 109). Employing a detailed transcription guideline, in this sense, helps discourse analysis be clearer and more concise. In addition to transcriptions, some words are provided with phonetic transcriptions where needed, using International Phonetic Transcription (IPA). To overcome anonymity concerns, speakers' identities are replaced with aliases in the transcriptions, and these aliases then were transformed into abbreviations to be used in the analysis part. After listening to nearly 300 minutes of online pair-work interaction, sequences that included negotiation of meaning were identified by using the model for negotiation of meaning proposed by Varonis and Gass in 1985. Identifying an NoM is not straightforward work as the surface shape of a negotiation sequence can make it difficult to come up with concrete assumptions about the parts that make up a negotiation process (Foster & Doha, 2005). To address this issue, detailing the descriptions of coding processes based on previous works is the preliminary process to ensure the validity of the analysis. This model includes finding clear trigger points in the conversation that are preceded by indicators of non-understandings. In some cases, although there is a Trigger, the negotiation is avoided, or Triggers and Indicators are inadequate to identify the sequence as NoM. In Transcript 1, GER and VAN are telling each other about the countries they have seen before. GER, in the previous turns, tells VAN that she has been to Norway before to make a childhood dream come true.

Transcript 1. Example of a sequence that is not regarded as a negotiation move

01 GER: i really wanted to see the northern lights

02 GER: and I went there for that. (T)

02 VAN: **you saw northern lights? really? (I)**

03 GER: yeah why? (R)

04 VAN: ((laughs))

In line 02, GER indicates that she went ‘there’ (meaning Norway regarding past turns) to see the Northern Lights. However, VAN almost sarcastically repeats the first part of the last turn and adds a (really?) to which GER replies (in line 03) with a confirmation token and a comprehension question (why?). VER laughing in the last line might indicate sarcasm as it is not a preferred response to a question for comprehension (van der Zwaard & Bannink, 2020). VER’s utterance in line 02 might be regarded as an indicator at first glance because of its surface structure. The utterance, in fact, shows disbelief towards the other party, not an indicator of nonunderstanding. The supporting evidence comes from GER’s response and VER’s reaction to response in lines 03 and 04 consecutively. Such instances are not counted as cases in the analysis.

After identifying the sequences of meaning negotiation, they are coded according to the strategies previously explicated in the works of Long (1983) and Pica & Doughty (1985). Clear definitions of each coding strategy are given in the literature review part to eliminate invalid coding processes. Another important notice is regarding how the coding is processed. Although many types of NoM are explained, coding accordingly is susceptible to being complex and misleading Overlapping structures are established and distinguished to maintain credibility. For example, if an other-repetition is utilized to check for confirmation it is coded only as a confirmation check and vice versa. Additionally, a sequence is counted as a NoM sequence only if meaning is successfully and explicitly negotiated.

To ensure coding accuracy, a colleague from the same department was enlisted as a second rater to code a portion of the data. The inter-rater reliability measures the accountability of the data categorization process. Cohen's kappa ($\kappa = 0.91$) was used to calculate inter-rater reliability, indicating strong agreement between the researcher and second-rater, as noted by McHugh (2012). After identifying NoM moves and ensuring accurate coding, the frequencies and percentages of each NoM move type were calculated holistically and between each pair. As the final part, steps of discourse analysis are as follows:

1. Analyzing transcriptions within the same code
2. Investigating reoccurring lexical items that start the negotiation sequence
3. Coding lexical items and chunks as a starting point for negotiation
4. Investigating how NoM moves function on a pragmatic level
5. Coding pragmatic-functions of NoM moves

The methodology of the study was outlined in this chapter, which included information on the research and sampling method, participant demographics, and data analysis process. Descriptive statistics will be used to present quantitative data and answer the first two research questions. The third question will be approached qualitatively by analyzing the discourse transcriptions. The next chapter will explain the findings by answering the questions in order.

Chapter 4

Findings, Comments, and Discussion

This chapter is dedicated to illustrating the findings of the study. The study searches for trends and functions in students' meaning negotiation moves by comparing their preferences and trajectories toward completing the assigned task. Findings include one-by-one discussions of the research questions analyzing distribution across pairings and different types of negotiation and commenting on how students prefer to make meaning in times of nonunderstanding.

Distribution of Meaning Negotiation Moves in the Research Data

RQ1.: Do Turkish EFL students negotiate meaning in an online problem-solving task?

Even with the limited amount of time and access to participants, a substantial amount of data revealed many cases that included a type of meaning negotiation (Swain & Lapkin, 1995). After finding how much each pair negotiated meaning, the arithmetic mean of the number of NoM moves of all pairs is calculated to be 9.4. Therefore, it can be concluded that pairs with fewer NoM moves than 9.4 are regarded as below the average. Although unlikely to contribute greatly and directly to the beneficial aspect of meaning-making processes, this numerical finding is essential in order to investigate the pairs in terms of how often they constructed meaning compared to other pairings. By revealing the pairs with low levels of NoM, we can scrutinize their conversation and speculate on what held them back or theorize whether the context was not enough to negotiate meaning. It is also possible to pinpoint certain problematic areas in which students may need more training and practice.

RQ1.1.: How negotiation of meaning moves are distributed among pairs?

The table below shows how NoM moves and avoidances are distributed among pairs.

Table 1

Distribution of negotiated meaning moves and avoidance of NoM

Pairs	***Total Number of Cases***	***Cases of Avoidance***
A	9	-
B	25	-
C	9	1
D	8	-
E	12	-
F	7	-
G	13	-
H	-	2
I	8	-
J	3	-
Total	**94**	**3**

However, the distribution of these negotiation episodes were found to be not balanced across every pairing. Our focus now turns to a noticeable variation in the total number of moves across pairs, ranging from Pair B with the highest count (25 moves) to Pair F with a comparatively lower count (7 moves). This disparity suggests that different pairs adopted distinct communication strategies, emphasizing the individualized nature of collaboration. The table indicates that half of the pairs (n=5) are way below the calculated average of the number of meaning negotiation moves across the whole data. Surprisingly, nearly all of the students did not avoid negotiation and continued to construct meaning with their partners. If we were to put the numbers on a number line, two extremities appear. The first extremity is Pair B which has a total of 25 moves which is drastically above the mean. On the contrary, in a somewhat rare case as seen in Pair H, the transcripted data from this pairing contained zero negotiation moves but two cases of avoidance of NoM which is inconsistent if we take other pairings.

While analyzing and grouping negotiation of meaning moves, it is also possible to subdivide them into two domains regarding their trigger points, which can be lexical or syntactic (Smith, 2003). The lexical domain of triggers refers to how vocabulary-oriented lexical items are discussed for mutual understanding. Examples can be problems with the

components of a sentence on a lexical level such as misinterpretations of word coinages, incorrect use of word inflections, use of circumlocution or approximation, L1 interference to L2, incomprehension due to direct translation from L1, and codeswitching. The lexical domain of negotiation in the data is found to be very scarce. In the case of the syntactical domain, meaning is not established because of the issues with the use of grammar. Common instances can vary from negative L1 transfer where interlocutors translate from L1 directly -and thus the meaning is shifted- to inconsistent verb tenses in which verb tenses within a single discourse are not coherent. There were found to be zero triggers of the grammatical domain. This might mean that students had no difficulties in constructing grammatically correct sentences and could retrieve lexical items when needed to a great extent. To put it simply, issues regarding the use of grammar were never a trigger point in students' successful negotiation processes (which is the only trigger in cases of avoidance), but problematic lexical items sometimes caused some misunderstandings which later initiated meaning-making.

One of the reasons for this issue might be related to the use of language. The language is rather limited and not diversified between the two themes provided for the students, which are (i) talking about living abroad and how to fit into a different culture or society, and (ii) awareness of sustainability and creating a sustainable city. Students naturally talk in the simple present tense and use modals of advice (should) and possibility (can, might) most of the time because they are trying to come up with solutions to problems. Additionally, they do not necessarily construct sentences that are grammatically complex or lexically intricate which might push them to meaning-making to grasp each other's ideas.

Types of Meaning Negotiation Moves in the Research Data

RQ2.: What types of negotiation of meaning do Turkish EFL students use in an online problem-based task?

Out of all pairing recordings, a total of 94 cases that include a type of NoM move were identified and then, coded accordingly on the basis explained in Chapter 3. The types

of NoM that were present in the study were found to be clarification requests, confirmation checks, comprehension checks, self-repetitions, other-repetitions, self-corrections, other-corrections, co-construction, and use of continuers. Table 2 shows the total number of cases regarding each NoM type.

Table 2

Distribution of types of NoM in the research data

Type of NoM	***Number of Cases***
Clarification Request	21
Confirmation Check	16
Comprehension Check	14
Self-correction	13
Self-repetition	9
Co-construction	8
Other-repetition	6
Other-correction	4
Continuer	3
Total	**94**

Clarification requests were found to be the most recurring type of meaning negotiation move, closely followed by confirmation checks. Long's three Cs modal remains the most dominant type by constituting almost half of the list. However, there are still some instances that cannot be coded by his design alone. When the preference over correction and repetition is compared, students were more inclined to use self-correction and self-repetition much more.

RQ2.1.: How are negotiation of meaning types employed by the learners distributed among pairs?

Table 3 shows how each category of NoM is distributed between pairs.

Table 3

Distribution of NoM types among pairs

Pairs/ NoM Types	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*	*H*	*I*	*J*	***Total***
Clarification Request	3	6	-	2	2	2	3	-	3	-	*21*
Confirmation Check	2	4	1	2	2	2	1	-	1	1	*16*
Comprehension Check	1	4	2	-	1	-	4	-	-	2	*14*
Self-repetition	2	2	1	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	*9*
Other-repetition	-	1	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	*6*
Self-correction	1	4	1	-	3	1	2	-	1	-	*13*
Other-correction	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	*4*
Co-construction	-	3	1	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	*8*
Continuer	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	*3*
Total	*9*	*25*	*9*	*8*	*12*	*7*	*13*	*-*	*8*	*3*	*94*

This table allows us to make assumptions on a dyadic level by cross-referencing each pair. The most outstanding finding is that clarification requests and confirmation checks emerge as consistently utilized NoM strategies across most pairs which underscores their fundamental roles in promoting both understanding and negotiation. However, although they were more abundant in the data, not every pair employed them in their negotiation of meaning sequences. 9 out of 10 pairs can be seen using confirmation checks and when compared to the clarification requests (7 out of 10), they seem much more of a common way of initiating a NoM sequence. This variation underscores the individualized nature of communication preferences and problem-solving strategies and that students frequently sought to enhance mutual understanding by seeking clarification.

Other important key points regarding the table are discussed in detail as follows:

- Each pair displays a unique combination of NoM strategies. For instance, Pair B incorporates a diverse range, including comprehension checks, self-corrections, and co-constructions, reflecting a multifaceted approach to negotiation. In contrast, Pair F exhibits a more focused strategy with fewer types of moves.
- Pairs H and J stand out due to their distinct patterns. Pair H did not engage in any NoM, potentially indicating a more silent or self-reliant problem-solving approach. Pair J, with only three moves, relied predominantly on confirmation checks and comprehension checks, suggesting a more streamlined communication style.
- The correction strategies vary across pairs, with some relying on self-corrections, others incorporating other-corrections, and some using a combination of both. This variability highlights the diverse approaches to rectifying and clarifying information during the task. An important highlight is related to how in any of the pairs other-correction exceeds self-correction.
- Pairs G and E demonstrate a notable emphasis on comprehension checks, indicating a shared concern for ensuring mutual understanding. This pattern suggests a proactive approach to confirming comprehension and avoiding potential misunderstandings.
- Some pairs did not utilize specific NoM strategies. For example, Pair D did not employ clarification requests, and Pair I did not engage in self-repetitions. These omissions could be indicative of the pairs' communication preferences or unique problem-solving methods. However, it is also important to indicate that not every strategy might be available to everyone.

- The variability in the number and types of NoM moves might be related to the complexity of the online problem-based task. Pairs with more moves, such as Pair B, might have encountered problems more than others thus extensive negotiation was necessitated in the conversation. This complexity can be further analyzed by cross-examining another task type with the same pairings and then comparing the findings.
- The varying number and types of NoM moves across pairs also highlight the diversity in group dynamics. Some pairs demonstrated more active and diversified communication, while others exhibited a more focused or limited interaction style. This suggests that group dynamics play a crucial role in shaping how students collaborate and negotiate meaning.
- The unique combination of NoM strategies within each pair reflects distinct communication styles. Some pairs may prefer a collaborative and interactive approach, as seen in Pair B with a wide range of moves, while others may lean towards more concise or individualized communication, as observed in Pair F with fewer moves.
- The complete absence of NoM in Pair H raises questions about their communication dynamics and use of communicative strategies. It may indicate a need for further exploration into how this pair approached the task, whether there was a high level of shared understanding that did not allow them to negotiate, or if there were challenges in articulating and clarifying their ideas. Another possible explanation can be that they do not possess enough speaking skills or self-consciousness to participate in any meaning-making with their partners.
- The variation in the number and types of NoM moves suggests that task complexity could influence communication patterns. Pairs with more extensive NoM engagement, like Pair B, may have encountered a more

complex task that required thorough clarification and negotiation. Conversely, pairs with fewer moves might have tackled tasks with simpler requirements.

- The frequent use of comprehension checks, especially in Pairs G and E, may indicate a heightened awareness of the task's complexity. Students in these pairs may have prioritized confirming their understanding due to the intricacies of the online problem-based task.
- The variability in correction strategies across pairs could be linked to the nature of the task. Pairs employing both of the correction strategies might have encountered challenges that prompted a range of responses to rectify the incoming information, or they are aware of the fact that correction can be beneficial to their second language acquisition.

In conclusion, every pair demonstrated a different approach to solving breakdowns. This showcases that even within the same proficiency level and doing the same task, there can be determining factors in how students make meaning, such as group dynamics, task complexity, and personalized strategy use. The next question will be an in-depth analysis of each negotiation type.

RQ3.: Are there any patterns regarding the negotiation of meaning moves employed by Turkish EFL students?

To answer this research question, parts, each coded NoM move type will be investigated and analyzed in detail in the following by referring to the transcripted conversations to comprehend how students negotiated meaning using different types of NoM strategies and to find if there are any trends in their NoM moves.

Comprehension Checks

Comprehension plays a key role especially when the conversion is in another language than the speaker’s mother tongue. While doing a speaking task, the flow can be

disrupted when comprehension is flawed. Nevertheless, it should not constitute a problem as it possibly enables space for meaning building. Rather than functions, some chunks were employed repeatedly to check for comprehension in the study. Some examples can be: “Do you understand me?”, “(Do) you got that?”, “Do you know what … is?”, “You good?”, “Do you know the meaning of …?”, “You know what I’m saying?”, and “So far so good?”.

Transcript: “You know what I’m saying?”

01	VIL:	when we end
02	VIL:	when the people (.) end
03	VIL:	uhh::
04	VIL:	and the earth <u>ends</u> at the same time
05	VIL:	not any more people can live
06		((VIL laughs))
07	VIL:	after the world is
08	VIL:	cannot <u>exist</u> anymo:re
09	VIL:	**you:: know >what I’m< sa:ying?** (comprehension check)
10	PIN:	>yeah yeah for sure<
11	PIN:	sustainability means sustaining sources for the future
12	VIL:	.hh right

Confirmation Checks

Checking for confirmation not only assures the previous turn but also prevents the subsequent one from being inconsistent in terms of meaning. It can also be used to gain time before replying. The main quota for a discourse to be accepted as a confirmation check is when it is performed with the intention to confirm the last utterance. In some instances, echoing a prior phrase or a singled-out word back to the source, especially with a rising tone, can be seen as rhetorical. Gestures might help us to eliminate this possibility since raising an eyebrow or frowning could mean either disbelief or amazement, rather than confusion.

In this study, students sought confirmation by employing various methods such as tag questions (*“Isn’t it?*), acknowledgment tokens (*“Right?”, “Yeah?”*), and mainly echoing the last utterance with a rising intonation. Although being the second most reoccurring type

of NoM move in the dataset, confirmation checks are the only type to be persistent throughout every pairing that negotiated meaning (excluding Pair H). It showcases that comprehension checking is a common way to overcome breakdowns.

Transcript: Egypt

01 GER: egypt ↑

02 GER: i wanna go to e:gypt

03 (0.7)

04 GER: so much

05 VIL: **egypt? (confirmation check)**

06 VIL: as in pyramids?

07 GER: ye:ah::

Self-Confirmation Checks

Confirmation checks are often documented to be employed by an interlocutor when someone indicates that there is a problem in understanding or conveying meaning in a joint effort. However, in some cases, these moves are performed by the speaker who produces the problematic utterance that is the trigger with no interactional outcome. Self-confirmation checks can help learners initiate a negotiation sequence; therefore, they can be in the form of triggers and indicators. Transcript 2 shows how BER indicates there was a problem with his previous turn. This conversation is from somewhere near the end of their recording as BER and AND are preparing for the task completion point by concluding what has been discussed.

Transcript 2. "To unite the thinkings of me..."

01 AND: do you ha::ve something to add?

02 BER: not much (.) but i could (.) uhm::: come up wit-with

03 BER: some sentences (.) to:: <u>unite</u>↑ the:: ahh

04 BER: thinking<u>s</u> of me=

05 BER: =these are not the right words >but if you understand<

06 BER: united [think]ings

07 AND: [go on]

08 BER: i can use some sentences (.) to unite (.) my thoughts

09 BER: i couldn't construct↓

10 BER: **°is it correct°**

11 AND: >i understand you<=

12 AND: =you mean you can summarize the podcast?

13 BER: yes: (.) thank you↓

AND asks BER for any parting words in line 01. BER shows hesitation by saying "*not much*" with a falling intonation. In the following lines (02,03, and 04), BER is trying to construct a complete sentence but encounters trouble as he cannot retrieve the correct vocabulary as he implies in line 05, "*these are not the right words"*. Then, he goes on to check for comprehension by including "*if you understand*" at the end of his sentence. AND's line in 07 serves as an encouragement but this cannot be regarded as an indicator because meaning is still not negotiated collaboratively. In line 09, BER clearly implies that he failed to construct a sentence and in the following line, 10, he almost whispers and asks himself for confirmation of his utterances. The *"is this correct"* serves as a self-confirmation check and may not be intended for initiating a negotiation of meaning regarding its volume. However, in line 12, it enables them to do so as AND negotiates meaning as he reformulates (Burch & Kley, 2020) what BER was trying to construct in the previous turns. This line acts as a confirmation check to which BER replies with *"yes thank you",* showing gratitude for the assistance he received. In this interaction, there is a collaborative effort to establish and negotiate the topic of conversation. BER initially offers to contribute, faces a moment of hesitation, seeks clarification, and receives encouragement from AND.

Checking for self-confirmation occurs in the data in three instances, all of which happened within the conversation of the same pair and utilized by the same student, and no other cases were identified in any other pairs. This case of self-monitoring can be reviewed as a learning strategy where a learner monitors their speech and find problematic areas of their discourse to resolve them without seeking explicit assistance. This resolution

can lead to self-correction or as in the previous transcription meaning negotiation. Regarding the case of BER and AND, repeated cases by the same student indicate a pattern that can be studied further to understand the nature of self-monitoring and how it can lead to a NoM sequence.

Clarification Request

Requesting clarification was found to be the most employed type of NoM in the data. Clarifying helps speakers ensure that their message is conveyed as intended, leaving almost no room for any different interpretation. Students used certain interrogative phrases such as “What?” and “Pardon?”. These are often referred to as open-class repair initiators (Drew, 1997). They are seen to initiate a NoM sequence and mainly serve as indicators of the misunderstanding. In the data, almost all of the clarification requests were comprised of open-class initiators.

Transcript 3 shows one instance that involves clarification requests and a comparison to convey and negotiate understanding between the participants. BUR and FER are talking about some countries they would like to live in the future.

Transcript 3. “Apart from visa”

01 BUR: i might live in korea (.) >for a year< because i lo::ve the culture

02 FER: sounds so nice but do you think it’s easy to live one year?

03 BUR: <well:: i gue:ss:?>=

04 FER: =>i mean apart from visa<

05 BUR: PARdon?

06 FER: apart from vi:sa

07 BUR: i guess it is easier than a schengen

BUR initiates the topic in line 01 by sharing the intention to live in Korea for a year due to a love for the culture. FER responds with a positive comment (*"sounds so nice"*) but then seeks clarification by asking about the ease of BUR's plan to live in Korea for a year. In line 03, BUR responds with "*well I guess”.* This indicates a level of uncertainty or

hesitation in confirming the ease of the plan since it is accompanied with a rising intonation. FER seeks further clarification by explicitly stating, "*I mean apart from visa*.". BUR responds with "Pardon?" indicating a need for repetition or clarification in Line 05. FER repeats the clarification, emphasizing *"Apart from visa."* BUR responds by acknowledging the clarification and providing an answer. BUR responds by comparing the process to a Schengen, providing a basis for understanding the perceived ease.

In this interaction, there is a sequence of turns where both BUR and FER respond with interest and seek clarification from each other. However, only one can be seen initiating a negotiation of meaning. Therefore, it can be concluded that every clarification request possibly leads to meaning negotiation is not the norm in this study.

Corrections

Corrections can be in the form of reconstructing a sentence with some tweaks or changing the choice of vocabulary. They can also be grammatical (for example, tense agreement and verb conjugation) and lexical (pronoun use, poor choice of wording). The total number of cases was 17 while self type was 13 and other type was 4. Correction as a negotiation of meaning move occurred in similar unfoldings for different purposes. Students employed both self- ad other- correction in times of the following (exemplified with cases):

- When they mispronounced a word,

01 PIN: Hungary
/ˈhʌngʌri/
02 PIN: Hungary
/ˈhʌŋgəri/

- To correct their inappropriate choice of vocabulary,

01 DER: i think we can ease the help
02 DER: ease the **problem**

- When they used a word in the sentence incorrectly,

01 ARS: the world is gonna run out the sources at some point
02 ARS: because we are using them as rapid as we can

03 ARS: as **rapidly** as we can

Students seemed to prefer to correct themselves rather than their partners as the cases of self-correction overnumbered the cases of other-correction (13 to 4). From this point, it is possible to theorize that “self is prioritized over other in this study”. Students are likely to be more conscious of their discourse than they are of others which is in line with what the Monitor Hypothesis suggests, proposed by Krashen (1981, 1982). The reason behind the preference may be related to the student’s perception of corrections since they might have a face-threatening act. Because in some cultures, or even because of the personality type of the speaker, other-correction is seen as disrespectful.

This phenomenon has already been discussed in the works of Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) and Varonis and Gass (1985). They also explicated some key points where correcting someone else is rather helpful than discouraging; adult-child and NS-NNS conversations respectively. Another case in the study might add the effect of students’ proficiency levels to the list. These cases involve how the proficiency level of students affects the use of corrections, especially in cases of other-corrections. If a learner accepts the other as a more proficient L2 user, they can favor or seek assistance which alleviates the threatening nature of other-corrections and transforms the interaction into a learning experience. In Transcript 4, AND and BER are discussing the countries they would like to visit in the future. BER proposes that Austria looks good enough to pay a visit someday.

Transcript 4. “Vienna”

01 BER: austria↑ looks <u>cool</u>

02 BER: >the capital city i mean<

03 BER: vienna (.) vienna↓

/viˈjʌnə/ /viˈjʌnə/

04 BER: not sure: if uhm:::

05 AND: vienna yeah

/viˈɛnə/

06 BER: .hhh thanks vienna

BER shows reluctance regarding his pronunciation of the city Vienna in lines 04 (falling intonation) and line 05 (*"not sure"*). AND provides BER with the correct pronunciation that acts as other-correction to which BER thanks in the next line. BER echoing the correct pronunciation in line 06 can be an indication that both the message and meaning are conveyed and BER treats it as uptake. Although Bitchener (200) argues that learners do not necessarily negotiate meaning triggered by pronunciation when they share the same L1 background, BER and AND successfully negotiate the correct pronunciation.

In Transcript 5, As PIL and BON collaboratively create a city, they are suggesting ways to generate energy. Using wind has already been listed in the previous turns. Now, they are discussing how to implement a system in the city for converting wind energy to electricity.

Transcript 5. "Air panels"

01 PIL: we can use those
02 PIL: li::ke u::hm
03 PIL: air panels
04 BON: it's wi[nd panels]
05 PIL: [like solar] (.) oh↑
06 PIL: yeah=yeah (.) wind panels

At the start of Transcript 5, PIL suggests airpower as a possible source (lines 01 and 03). The incorrect use of the lexical item (*"air panels"*) is repaired by BON (*"it's wind panels"*) in the next turn, almost immediately. This correction is done overtly by BON and PIL did not showcase any problem with being corrected in the subsequent turns. PIL's uptake can be seen as echoing the correct use of stressing the word wind in line 06.

Taking these two cases into account, we can conclude that correction can be helpful rather than discouring as both instances included a similar unfolding which ends with an uptake. Moreover, drawing from the findings of Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) and Varonis and Gass (1985, it can be argued here that when one speaker accepts the other

speaker as a more proficient source, it can help them to turn the negotiated meaning move into a learning experience.

In both cases,

1. Speaker 1 showed reluctance or hesitation about their discourse
2. Speaker 2 provided help by negotiating meaning (Assistance)
3. Speaker 1 noticed the modified input by reacting explicitly (Acceptance)
4. Speaker 1 turned the modified input into uptake by echoing or reformulation (Acceptance)

Therefore, we can argue that this pattern showcases that when modified input is accepted, it can be transformed into uptake. This phenomenon happened in the data in three stages; assistance, alleviation, and acceptance. In assistance, one speaker assists the other by providing negotiated input. Then, the face-threatening nature of correction is alleviated as the other speaker notices and reacts to the modification. Finally, the input is accepted since it appears in the conversation as uptake.

Repetitions

Repeating a turn signals both misunderstanding and understanding as it is highly context-dependent. Repetitions that indicate misunderstanding can be identified based on the suprasegmental features of language such as falling and rising intonation (Fernández-García & Martínez-Arbelaiz, 2002). In some contexts, repetition can be used as acknowledgment or to show emotion. This is often referred to as *"echoing"*.

Confirmation checks can have the same face structure as other-repetitions, this is why identifying them can be deceiving. Therefore, clear definitions and distinctions must be provided. Confirmation checks and repetitions can be separated from each other in terms of the following (which was also used for in the coding process to ensure accuracy):

1) checking for confirmation is generally explicit, and direct, and can accompanied by other questions for specifying the problem,

2) repetitions can be regarded as indicators for the successful conveyance of the message but make no interpretations of meaning whereas confirmation checks also indicate the message is conveyed but the meaning is questioned because its' unclarity is accepted by both parties.

After analyzing both self and other repetitions in the conversations, some functions for the use of repetitions were identified. In the data, repetitions were employed by the students:

- To show comprehension of the previous turn,

01 PIN: wo::w↑ that's actually really cool

02 CAN: **that's actually really cool**

03 CAN: yeah

04 CAN: when you look from the people's perspective

- To affirm or show agreement,

01 VER: rate of (.) changing the: clothing a::nd wellness

02 ADA: do you mea::n the quality of the clothing?

03 VER: **the quality of the clothing** (.) the trends (.) the fashion ideas

- To claim the next turn,

01 FAT: as human beings we are social

02 AND: **we are social** creatures=

03 AND: =definitely

- To buy time to construct the sentence,

01 HAS: the air travel

02 (1.2)

03 HAS: the air travel.

04 (0.7)

05 HAS: the amount of **air travel** can be reduced

One of the functions coincides with that of Lazaro and Azpilicueta (2015) that self-repetition is sometimes utilized to provide an answer to clarification requests or confirmation

checks. In this study, it is revealed that other-repetitions are also can be utilized to affirm and show agreement with the other.

The “self over other” argument explained in corrections applies to repetitions as well. It must be noted in this sense that in Eastern countries, for example, China, self-repetition is highly favored (Si-Qing, 1980). Even though repetitions are not like corrections in the sense that they do not typically pose a sense of discouragement to the other person, repeating a word too much might indicate a problem and serve as a trigger.

Co-construction

Co-construction as a strategy can emphasize social, interactive, and collaborative aspects of learning and communication which highlights the importance of working together to construct shared understanding in different contexts. There were eight instances of co-construction in the study. Every instance happened when one student started mitigating or displayed overtly disrupting problems while constructing a complete sentence. In a couple of cases, co-construction moves are utilized to take turns in order to speed up the conversation, almost like completing a sentence for the sake of the flow of the conversation.

Example taken from the research data

01 ABR: organic farming is u:sing only

02 ABR: uhh::

03 ABR: the resources at the moment

04 ABR: not using

05 *(2.0)*

06 ABR: hmm:

07 BAD: **<u>ch</u>emicals an:d pesticides** *(co-construction)*

08 ABR: yeah

Continuers

As explained by Foster and Doha (2005), continuers are utterances that a speaker employs to show interest in hearing more about a topic. However, continuers were

employed the least in only three cases. Therefore, they constituted no conection to link each instance. In one instance, a student abruptly turned to Turkish (*"Yaa nasıl yani?", Eng: "Really? How come?")* and immediately translated her utterance by apologizing *("sorry, how that happened?"*). Her intriguing and unexpected display of amazement and interest in the topic encouraged her partner to explain the situation in detail rather than disturbing the flow of the conversation. However, the study did not code the instance as negotiation therefore it was opted out from a deeper analysis.

Example taken from the research data

01 ATI: <i would like to go there> a:nd (.) see the food

02 FIL: **only food? (Continuer)**

03 ATI: well not <u>only</u> foo:d uhh

Avoiding Negotiation of Meaning

Foster (1998) indicates that if the task design requires the exchange and acquisition of information, negotiation can be difficult to avoid. Even though the task in this study was performed in pairs, there were a few instances of avoidance. Preference for not negotiating meaning can be detrimental to language acquisition. Ya-ni (2007) considers avoidance as affecting language learning negatively because it forgoes possible moments of uptake. Avoidances can be in the form of changing to L1, forgoing the construction of a sentence, or shifting the topic. L1 use eliminates possible learning moments because the meaning is not conveyed in L2. However, the students in the study did not resort to L1 when breakdowns occurred. What happened was forgoing their turn without co-constructing meaning or changing the topic to move on without addressing their problematic turns.

Avoiding negotiation of meaning is found to happen in only two of the pairs. Transcript 7 shows one of the cases. This pair is Pair H, the pair that did not use any NoM moves in their conversation but rather avoided doing so two times. ARS and BEL are talking about living abroad. The topic shifted towards how hard it is to be able to start a life abroad without having a strong financial background.

Transcript 7. An instance of avoidance

01	ARS:	economical issues are more less
02		(1.6)
03	ARS:	more (.) more uh::m
04		(2.2)
05	ARS:	whatever
06		((both laughing))
07	BEL:	i see it's okay

In the first line, ARS is trying to construct a sentence but seems to be having a hard time finding the right quantifier for the word "*economical issues*". His struggle is shown to be continuing with repetitions of *"more"* and his use of uhm -which Dörnyei (1995) explains as a communication maintenance strategy- in line 02. In the next line, ARS gives up on trying to complete the sentence that he started in line 01 by saying "*whatever*". As a response, the pair laugh together. This laughter can indicate the ending of a sequence (Haugh & Musgrave, 2018). BEL does not indicate any explicit understanding rather she comforts him by saying "it is okay". This does not necessarily indicate that there is a mutual agreement and there is no follow-up as they change the subject to another downside of living abroad. In the end, there is no negotiation of meaning because of two reasons; one, BEL did not produce an indicator as ARS tried to construct the utterance which later allowed ARS to dismiss the topic, and two, the pair did not initiate a negotiation move by showing an inclination toward a joint effort of meaning-making. A possible meaning negotiation is avoided in line 07 as BEL indicates she understood ARS. It is unknown whether ARS and BEL reached the same conclusion from line 01 because there was no negotiation. BEL's utterance *"i see it's okay"* can serve as a trigger in avoiding negotiation, because it can be the initiation of NoM if she shows a willingness to co-construct meaning.

In addition to delving into the intricacies of how students navigate the negotiation of meaning, an equally insightful avenue of exploration lies in studying instances where students avoid engaging in such negotiations. This alternative perspective can provide valuable insights into the dynamics of communication from a sociocultural standpoint. The

decision to avoid negotiation may be contingent upon various factors, including the students' familiarity with each other, their proficiency levels in the language, or even their distinctive personality traits. From a sociocultural lens, the tapestry of interpersonal relationships, language proficiency, and individual characteristics play a pivotal role in shaping communication dynamics. Factors such as the level of acquaintance between students or their varying degrees of language proficiency can influence their inclination to avoid negotiations. Moreover, individual personality traits may also contribute to the divergence in communication preferences, reflecting the nuanced interplay between social context and linguistic interaction.

Alternatively, the nature of online interaction introduces a unique dimension to the avoidance of negotiation. Given the prevalence of technical challenges and errors inherent in virtual communication platforms, students may opt to steer clear of negotiation due to potential disruptions. Technical issues, particularly those affecting the quality of sound, can compromise the comprehensibility of the input, creating an environment where effective negotiation becomes a more daunting task. In this context, the susceptibility of online interaction to technical problems adds a layer of complexity to the avoidance of negotiation, warranting a closer examination of how these external factors impact the communicative landscape. Therefore, a comprehensive exploration of both the act of negotiating meaning and the instances of avoidance in the context of online interaction contributes to the understanding of language dynamics. This multifaceted approach enriches research endeavors by shedding light on the diverse factors that shape communication patterns, encompassing sociocultural influences and the unique challenges posed by virtual platforms.

In conclusion, as the study assumed, Turkish EFL students negotiated meaning while doing problem-based tasks in an online conversation setting. Yaman et al. (2013) concluded that intermediate-level students used negotiation of meaning strategies more

than advanced-level students. Their finding is in line with this study as the participants were university-level intermediate EFL students.

There were more cases of employing clarification requests than confirmation and comprehension checks which is in line with the findings of Kötter (2003). However, confirmation checks were more common than any other type of NoM in terms of distribution across pairings. This suggests that numerical comparisons do not necessarily mean one type is superior to another. It is the consistency of a type that might function as a key point. Other studies detected other types of NoM such as confirmation checks (Abdullah, 2011; Hartono & Ihsan, 2016) or self-repetition (Oliver, 2009; Uztosun & Erten, 2014) to be the most reoccurring.

Correcting or repeating is favored to be self-driven rather than other-driven and it is a common finding in some negotiation of meaning research (Lázaro & Azpilicueta, 2015; Oliver, 2002). One of the reasons comes from the fact that they can be perceived as face-threatening (Dronia, 2013). Lázaro and Azpilicueta (2015) found that repetitions were utilized to reply to clarification requests and confirmation checks or to indicate acceptance. Similarly, some pragmatic functions for the use of repetitions in this study were showing affirmation of the previous turn and providing answers to comprehension checks in addition to the other two.

Fernández-García and Martínez-Arbelaiz (2002) described switching to L1 as a common behavior among their Spanish students learning English. However, this was not the case in this study. Students in the study negotiated meaning using the target language (English) all the time as there were no cases where they resorted to their native language (Turkish) to resolve breakdowns. Although some instances of L1 use were recorded due to code-switching, these cases were neither part of their NoM processes nor did they affect the intended meaning.

Chapter 5

Conclusion, Discussion, and Suggestions

This last chapter contains the summary of the research by explicating the process and discussing the findings, Then, moves on to the implications for EFL classrooms and teachers. Finally, the chapter, and the study, end by offering suggestions for further research.

Summary of the Study

This research aimed to investigate how Turkish EFL students negotiate meaning in online problem-based tasks by analyzing their negotiation of meaning moves in the transcriptions of their task recordings. The participants were students participating in Intermediate-level courses at a preparatory school of a state university. They worked in pairs and recorded a podcast including a problem-based discussion, then the recordings were collected via the classroom teacher. The data of this study was the transcriptions of recordings that were transcribed by the researcher.

To answer the first research question (RQ), instances of negotiation of meaning (NoM) were identified by using the model presented by Varonis and Gass (1985) and each instance was coded in line with Long (1983) and Pica and Doughty (1985). The study found that Turkish EFL learners do negotiate meaning in order to overcome communicational breakdowns by employing various types of NoM moves. Even within the same proficiency level, learners still create possibilities to negotiate meaning and learn from each other by doing so. The participants made 94 moves of NoM in total. The pair with the most negotiation sequences almost tripled the mean average of NoM moves in numbers. A pair did not showcase any negotiation at all. This raised questions about their communication dynamics and problem-solving process. Further investigation into this particular pair's interaction could provide insights into whether their lack of NoM strategies was a conscious choice, a result of a highly synchronized collaboration, or potentially a point of concern

regarding mutual understanding. This uneven distribution of moves among pairs reveals that not every pair doing the same task is guaranteed to participate in NoM.

Some unexpected cases of negotiation avoidance were present in the findings as well. Students avoided or halted negotiating of meaning by shifting the topic and moving on without addressing the problem. Further microanalytical research can reveal the nature of avoidances answering why and how negotiation is avoided in certain points of task doing. The most common type of NoM was clarification requests with 21 cases and the least common strategy was using continuers with only three cases. However, despite being the most common type, clarification requests were not employed by every pair. Moreover, pairs that negotiated meaning in a way included at least one confirmation check in their meaning-making process.

The second research question is answered by analyzing the students' discourses in the transcriptions to find any functions or preferences. Students showed a tendency to correct and repeat themselves rather than their partners in the tasks because the cases of both self-repetition and self-correction were greater in number than the other-repetition and other-correction. Therefore, considering these, the study suggested that self is prioritized over other. The students employed repetitions that are categorized into serving four different functions; to show comprehension of the previous turn, to affirm or show agreement, to claim the next turn, and to buy time to construct the sentence. Corrections were employed when they mispronounced a word, when they corrected their choice of vocabulary, and when they used a word incorrectly in a sentence. Another finding is that a few times negotiation sequences with confirmation checks happened solely without promoting or signaling collaboration. These are referred to as self-confirmation checks. In cases of avoidances, the trigger was always related to issues with grammar such as constructing a grammatically correct sentence.

The third research question is answered by comparing the findings with earlier studies that were conducted in the same vein as this study. Regardless of diversions, there were many common points. Some similarity can be discussed as the following,

- English as a Foreign Language learners revealed to negotiate meaning while doing communicational tasks (Lázaro-Ibarrola & Azpilicueta-Martinez, 2022; Shibata, 2022; Wang, 2019),
- Online interaction constituted many instances of NoM for L2 learners (Arslanyilmaz & Pederson, 2010; Fernández-García & Martínez-Arbelaiz, 2002; Smith, 2003; Tecedor, 2023),
- Tasks that require problem-solving skills help L2 learners to make meaning collaboratively (Eslami-Kung, 2016; Wang; 2019),
- In the Turkish context, learners employed different strategies to overcome interactional barriers while doing communicational tasks (Arpacı-Somuncu, 2016; Yaman, Irgin & Kavasoglu, 2013; Yaman & Özcan, 2015; Yüksel & İnan, 2014),
- Self-repetitions and self-correction were favored more than other-repetition and other-correction (Oliver, 2002; Lázaro-Ibarrola & Azpilicueta-Martinez, 2022),
- Even though the study was not intended to be focused on missed opportunities of NoM, it has been revealed that students sometimes avoided negotiation of meaning despite indicating a problem in understanding. Analyzing the said phenomenon, a pattern regarding avoidance of negotiating meaning was found to be shifting the topic without letting the others co-construct meaning (van der Zwaard & Bannik, 2016).

The significance of the study was being conducted on meaning negotiation moves within a Turkish context, where more research is needed to address the generalizability and

credibility, in the field of SLA and strategy training. Earlier studies investigating the use of NoM strategies in classroom environments focused on various types of tasks, namely decision-making activities (Eslami & Kung, 2016), storytelling (Ko et al., 2003), information-gap tasks (Shibata, 2022), conversation tasks through videoconferencing (van der Zwaard & Bannink, 2019; Tecedor, 2023), jigsaws (Oliver, 2009; Yüksel & İnan, 2014). The task type in the study was conversational and problem-based and it was implemented online through call-conferencing apps. Thus, the findings offer further information on how a different type of task elicits different NoM moves in the student task talk as well as in the online medium. Finally, the study suggests that incorporating strategy training in NoM can help students learn how to overcome problems in their conversation and encourage them to construct meaning with peers.

As every study, this study also has limitations regarding the generalizability and the data collection process. The participants were a group of students withing the same classroom, therefore more studies are needed to paint a more comprehensive picture. However, this study has no intention to generalize but to establish a foundation for further studies. The data was collected through online interaction and since misunderstandings may arise more easily due to the absence of immediate feedback and may lead to reduced spontaneity in interactions. Delayed responses may hinder the natural flow of conversation and negotiation of meaning. Ambiguous language or misinterpretations may persist without the prompt clarification that can occur in face-to-face interactions. Additionally, online learning environments often lack the social aspects of face-to-face interactions, potentially leading to feelings of isolation. A sense of community and a supportive learning environment are important for successful language acquisition.

Implications for EFL Classrooms and Teachers

Negotiated interactions have been documented by many studies discussed thoroughly in this study to have a positive relationship with language learning as explained many times in the literature review. NoM promotes second language learning in a way that

enables students to retain negotiated input even after a period of time (Bitchener, 2004). Fuente (2002) supports that participating in negotiation of meaning helps learners because it exposes them to modified conversations that are a little below their level and promotes L2 acquisition when students incorporate these into their L2 repertoires. Oliver's 2002 study revealed that NNS-NNS pairings produce more negotiation, which means that they constitute more opportunities for turning modified input into intake. Language classrooms are advantageous in this sense as the students are NNS of the target language. Therefore, this enables language classrooms to be the best and one of the most promising environments to prompt meaning-making processes. The most suitable and beneficial way to achieve this would be through implementing appropriate tasks that are both interactional and meaning-driven and can provide instances of NoM.

Training students to speak in the target language can be overlooked in language classrooms because it can be a lengthy process to assess for teachers and a daunting task to undergo for students. Students can be afraid of practicing the skill and attaining it might seem exhausting and nerve-wracking (Yuniarti, 2017). In addition, communication breakdowns might hinder the aptitude of the students. However, teaching and attaining such skills can be a great success with supportive strategies and interactional tasks with a clear outcome and goal. Instances of NoM are documented to provide students with a substantial amount of output in which they can practice their speaking skills even in online settings (Yeh & Lai, 2019). Giving strategy training to students in language classrooms in communication breakdowns using NoM strategies can help teachers boost student confidence in speaking as well as positively affect their language aptitude.

Offering training to EFL learners in equipping them with effective strategies to address communication-related challenges is crucial. This emphasis becomes even more significant when tailored to the specific context of Turkish language schools. It is imperative to develop and implement instructional programs that focus on enhancing the communicative skills of EFL learners. The training should encompass a comprehensive

range of strategies designed to tackle various communication obstacles that may arise during language learning. These strategies can include improving listening comprehension, refining speaking skills, mastering effective written communication, and navigating cultural nuances in English language contexts. Moreover, special attention should be devoted to contextualizing these strategies within the framework of Turkish language schools. Understanding the unique challenges and preferences of learners within this particular setting allows for the creation of targeted and culturally relevant training modules.

When developing training programs focused on NoM strategies, the study's results can be utilized to enhance their effectiveness. There are several key aspects to consider, including the following.

- While requesting clarification or checking for confirmation and comprehension, students can use certain chunks. For example: Explicit questions such as “Do you mean…?”, “What does ….. mean?”, and “Can you elaborate on….?” or open-class repair initiators (What?, Pardon?) for clarification requests. Using tag questions (isn’t it?), one-liners (Yeah?, Right?), and repetition with rising intonation for confirmation check. Direct questions (“Did you get it?”, “You know?”, “Do you understand what I’m saying?”) and reformulations in the form of questions for comprehension checks.
- Students can employ repetitions as strategies in various ways such as to buy time, to confirm, to take the next turn. Correcting or repeating others while discussing should not be regarded as impolite but rather educational.
- Strategy programs should also include some assistance strategies to build meaning in a joint effort such as how to show your interest in hearing more about a topic to your partner using continuers and how to utilize co-construction in conversation without interrupting or discouraging the other.

Teachers who are planning to include meaning negotiation in their language classes must keep in mind that quality must precede quantity. It is not only about how much students negotiate meaning with each other but also about how successful they are in initiating, maintaining, and terminating the negotiation process. To achieve this, carefully designed appropriate tasks that elicit the production of NoM moves must be introduced to the classroom (Richards & Schmidt, 2013). Studies that are in line with this investigate to understand which tasks propose the most opportunities. This also applies to conducting research on this subject. Investigating how many cases of NoM types are in a conversation only covers the surface of how students contribute to the meaning-making process. By closely analyzing the episodes, we can deduce what goes wrong in communication and how they are solved, which types of activities hinder negotiation opportunities so that educators can adjust their communicative tasks, and what kinds of strategy training can and should be included in the curriculum (Yaman & Özcan, 2015).

Regarding their assessment of speaking skills, teachers who train their students in negotiation strategies can also include them as a part of their rubric. The interactional competence (as proposed by Kramsch in 1986) and strategic competence (Canale & Swain, 1980) both encompass being able to maintain a fluent conversation collaboratively. Moreover, such competences entail the skills of using different communication strategies to resolve breakdowns, displaying correct use of intonation and stress, and being a good listener. When the flow of the conversation is flawed, learners might employ the strategies they have learned to comprehend each other and reach a mutual understanding. Therefore, integrating them into the assessment of speaking can help both teachers and students. For teachers to see the effectiveness and to detect the problematic areas where further training is needed and for students to help them converse more confidently and know what to do to resolve difficulties together.

Hull and Saxon argue in their 2009 paper that individuals in a group tend to engage in joint problem-solving when activities are designed to promote collaborative knowledge-

building. The study provides evidence that collaborative interaction is a necessary and sufficient condition for effective learning when knowledge-building is a desired objective of the task. This finding has important implications for online communication and interaction, as many online courses lack opportunities for instructor-student and student-student interactions, which can hinder the effectiveness of the learning process. Consequently, teacher training in the co-construction of meaning should be given more importance along with student strategy training.

Suggestions for Future Research

Further research in Turkish contexts can expand our understanding of how different sociocultural environments affect meaning-making. Since there is evidence that cultural backgrounds have an impact on the use of communication strategies (Grainger, 2012; Hsieh, 2014), implementing similar studies can add to the literature to define clear distinctions as well as similarities between contexts. Furthermore, different variables affecting the negotiation process can be studied such as age, gender, and education level of the students.

Another focus can be on different types of tasks and how each differs from the other in terms of negotiation sequences, for example, a communicative role-play task and an information gap activity. Some studies (Abdullah, 2011; Jeong, 2011) underline that task type serves as an indicator regarding the quantity and the type of NoM moves. These studies can help us understand what types of activities encourage students to negotiate meaning more and provide insight into lesson planning for teachers and educators and what kinds of tasks can be included in the strategy training.

From this point, a separate branch of research can emerge, that is the effect of strategy training on the negotiation of meaning. As mentioned repeatedly in this study, training second language students to enhance and practice their strategic competences should include the unfolding of meaning negotiation processes. A framework for such strategy training can be structured with the help of studies on how such training benefits

students. After receiving the training, researchers can focus on whether students could reach a mutual agreement by negotiating or if they need more or varied types of training. Longitudinal studies are one way to achieve this as they are employed to establish a holistic overview. Furthermore, inclusive language strategy training programs can take different classrooms with special needs in their scope.

Since, in this study, a macro analysis of discourse was conducted rather than a microanalysis, a conversation analytic (CA) approach (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) to the negotiation of meaning sequences can help us to reveal the nature of noticing and uptake of negotiated interaction. It is crucial to pay attention to every detail during interaction (Heritage, 2013), and CA requires access to all conversation details to ensure the gathered evidence is valid and reliable. CA investigates conversation on a micro-level and scrutinizes the “how” and the “why” of a turn in a sequence. The approach implies that conversation is a collaborative effort between participants, with dynamic and reciprocal social actions being essential, which is accountable to the foundation of negotiating meaning. Each speaker contributes to the conversation in a context-specific manner, building on what has been previously said and shaping the context for the following speakers as responses will be based on other responses. Therefore, CA can foster our understanding of both successful and unsuccessful cases of NoM.

Wigham and Chanier (2013) assert the paramount significance of non-verbal conduct, encompassing gestures and facial expressions, in facilitating effective communication. The nuanced interplay of para-lingual elements adds a layer of complexity to interpersonal interactions, enabling individuals to convey messages beyond verbal articulation. Notably, the silent yet influential para-lingual contributions to discourse introduce both implicit messages and the potential for misunderstandings. It's noteworthy to mention that the current research does not delve into the comprehensive analysis of these non-verbal elements. Consequently, there exists an untapped opportunity for further exploration into the role of gestures, facial expressions, and other para-lingual components

in shaping meaning-making strategies. Understanding the impact of para-lingual cues, taking into consideration the concept of noticing, can shed light on their pivotal role in influencing the negotiation of meaning within communicative sequences. Research in this direction could uncover valuable insights into the intricate dynamics of communication, ultimately contributing to a more holistic understanding of language interaction.

Moreover, the study catalyzes future research endeavors. It underscores the importance of delving deeper into how negotiation processes unfold, particularly in moments of breakdown, across varied contexts and cultural backgrounds. This avenue of inquiry holds immense potential for characterizing diverse learner dynamics, offering a more comprehensive understanding of the complexities involved in language acquisition. Thus, while the findings may not be broadly generalizable, they lay a foundation for broader discussions and investigations, prompting researchers to explore the nuances of negotiation in language learning across diverse contexts and cultural landscapes.

To sum up, the objective of this study was to emphasize the significance and necessity of strategy training in EFL courses in Turkish contexts from the perspective of how meaning negotiation processes take place in online task-doing environments. By taking part in NoM sequences, L2 learners are presented with numerous opportunities to encounter comprehensible input which can be produced by a more skilled peer. If this input is successfully transformed into uptake, it can greatly contribute to language proficiency and advancement. Therefore, teaching and practicing different communication strategies that are commonly situated in meaning-making sequences in language teaching courses is of great importance for both collaboration skills and progression in a second language.

References

Abdullah, U. (2011). EIL in practice: Indonesian and Chinese international postgraduate students negotiate meaning. *TEFLIN Journal*, 22(2), 103.

Akayoğlu, S., & Seferoğlu, G. (2019). An analysis of negotiation of meaning functions of advanced EFL learners in Second Life: Negotiation of meaning in Second Life. In *Assessing the effectiveness of virtual technologies in foreign and second language instruction* (pp. 61-85). IGI Global.

Arpacı-Somuncu, D. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' use of communication strategies and its predictors. *ELT Research Journal*, 5(3), 178-192.

Arslanyilmaz, A. (2012). An Online Task-Based Language Learning Environment: Is It Better for Advanced-or Intermediate-Level Second Language Learners?. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 11(1), 20-35.

Arslanyilmaz, A., & Pedersen, S. (2010). Enhancing Negotiation of Meaning through Task Familiarity Using Subtitled Videos in an Online TBLL Environment. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 9(2), 64-77.

Barrows, H. S., & Kelson, A. C. (1995). Problem-based learning in secondary education and the problem-based learning institute. *Problem-Based Learning Institute*, 1(1), 1-5.

Bitchener, J. (2000). Do advanced L2 learners benefit from the negotiation of meaning?. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 6, 23–51.

Bitchener, J. (2004). The relationship between the negotiation of meaning and language learning: A longitudinal study. *Language Awareness*, 13(2), 81-95.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge University Press.

Burch, A. R., & Kley, K. (2020). Assessing interactional competence: The role of intersubjectivity in a paired-speaking assessment task. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment*, 9(1), 25-63.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.

Canals, L. (2021). Multimodality and translanguaging in negotiation of meaning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 54(3), 647-670.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied linguistics*, 6(2), 5-35.

Chen, H. I., & Sevilla-Pavón, A. (2023). Negotiation of meaning via virtual exchange in immersive virtual reality environments. *Language Learning & Technology*, 27(2), 118–154.

Cohen, A. D. (2003). *Strategy training for second language learners*. Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. EDO-FL-03-02)

Cook, V. J. (1992). Evidence for multicompetence. *Language learning*, 42(4), 557-591.

Creswell, J. (2012). *Research design (2nd Edition).* Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. P. (2011). *Mixed methods research*. Sage.

Deen, J., & van Hout, R. (1991). Clarification sequences in native–nonnative interaction. In R. van Hout & E. Huls (Eds.), *Artikelen van de eerste sociolinguistische coneferentie* (pp. 121–138). Eburon.

van der Zwaard, R., & Bannink, A. (2014). Video call or chat? Negotiation of meaning and issues of face in telecollaboration. *System,* 44, 137–148.

van der Zwaard, R., & Bannink, A. (2016). Nonoccurrence of negotiation of meaning in task-based synchronous computer-mediated communication. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(3), 625–640.

van der Zwaard, R., & Bannink, A. (2018). Reversal of participation roles in NS-NNS synchronous telecollaboration. *CALICO Journal*, 35(2), 162–181.

van der Zwaard, R., & Bannink, A. (2019). Toward a comprehensive model of negotiated interaction in computer-mediated communication. *Language Learning & Technology*, 23(3), 116–135.

van der Zwaard, R., & Bannink, A. (2020). Negotiation of meaning in digital L2 learning interaction: Task design versus task performance. *Tesol Quarterly*, 54(1), 56-89.

Drew, P. (1997). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28(1), 69-101.

Dronia, I. (2013). Teacher discourse and the language of questions as a source of face-threatening acts. *Linguistica Silesiana*, 319-334.

Doughty, C., & Pica, T. (1986) Information gap tasks: Do they facilitate second language learning? *TESOL Quarterly,* 20, 305–25.

Doughty, C., & Long, M. (2003). Optimal psycholinguistic environments for distance foreign language learning*. Language Learning & Technology*, 7(3), 50-80.

Dörnyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 55-85.

Ellis, R. (2003). Task-based language learning and teaching. *Oxford University Press.*

Eslami, Z. R., & Kung, W. T. (2016). Focus-on-form and EFL learners' language development in synchronous computer-mediated communication: task-based interactions. *The Language Learning Journal*, 44(4), 401-417.

Farangi, M. R., Nejadghanbar, H., Askary, F. & Ghorbani, A. (2016). The Effects of podcasting on EFL upper-intermediate learners' speaking skills. *CALL-EJ*, 16(2), 1-18.

Fernández-García, M., & Martínez-Arbelaiz, A. (2002). Negotiation of meaning in nonnative speaker-nonnative speaker synchronous discussions. *Calico Journal*, 279-294.

Foster, P. (1998). A classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 19, 1-26.

Fuente, M. J. (2002). The roles of input and output in the receptive and productive acquisition of words. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24(1), 81- 112.

Garner, M., & Borg, E. (2005). An ecological perspective on content-based instruction. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4(2), 119–134.

Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gass, S. M., & Selinker L. (1994). *Second Language Acquisition: An introductory course.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1985). Task variation and nonnative–nonnative negotiation of meaning. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.)*, Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 149–161). Newbury House.

Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 283–302.

Grainger, P. (2012). The impact of cultural background on the choice of language learning strategies in the JFL context. *System*, 40(4), 483-493.

Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press.

Gromik, N. (2008). EFL learner use of podcasting resources: A pilot study. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 4(2), 47–60.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective* (Vol. 2). Oxford University Press.

Hartono, R., & Ihsan, D. (2016). An analysis of meaning negotiation strategies used in conversation by undergraduate EFL students. In *Ninth International Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN 9)* (pp. 260-263). Atlantis Press.

Haugh, M., & Musgrave, S. (2019). Conversational lapses and laughter: Towards a combinatorial approach to building collections in conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 143, 279-291.

Heritage, J. (2013). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. John Wiley & Sons.

Hinkel, E., & Fotos, S. (2002). From theory to practice: A teacher's view. *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms*, 1-12.

Hiraga, M. K., & Turner, J. M. (1996). Differing Perceptions of Face in British and Japanese Academic Settings. *Language Sciences*, 18, 605-627.

Hull, D. M., & Saxon, T. F. (2009). Negotiation of meaning and co-construction of knowledge: An experimental analysis of asynchronous online instruction. *Computers & Education*, 52(3), 624-639.

Hsieh, A. F. Y. (2014). The effect of cultural background and language proficiency on the use of oral communication strategies by second language learners of Chinese. *System*, 45, 1-16.

Jeong, N. S. (2011). The effects of task type and group structure on meaning negotiation in synchronous computer-mediated communication. In *Proceedings of the 2009 Second Language Research Forum: Diverse Contributions to SLA* (pp. 51-69).

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Eds.*), Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. Sage.

Kelm, O. (1992) The use of synchronous computer networks in second language instruction: a preliminary report. *Foreign Language Annuals*, 25, 441–454.

Kern, R. (1995) Restructuring classroom interaction with networked computers: Effects on quantity and quality of language production. *Modern Language Journal*, 79, 457–476.

Kim, N. Y. (2017). Effects of types of voice-based chat on EFL students' negotiation of meaning according to proficiency levels. *English Teaching*, 72(1), 159-181.

Ko, J., Schallert, D. L., & Walters, K. (2003). Rethinking scaffolding: Examining negotiation of meaning in an ESL storytelling task. *Tesol Quarterly*, 37(2), 303-324.

Koçak, A., & Alagözlü, N. (2021). The Effect of Learner Podcasts on EFL Students' Speaking Development. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 11(2), 18-41.

Kötter, M. (2003). Negotiation of meaning and code-switching in online tandems. *Language Learning & Technology*, 7, 145–172.

Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(4), 366-372.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.

Kumar, R. (2018). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners*. 1-528. Sage.

Lázaro, A., & Azpilicueta, R. (2015). Investigating negotiation of meaning in EFL children with very low levels of proficiency. *International Journal of English Studies,* 15(1), 1-21.

Lázaro-Ibarrola, A., & Azpilicueta-Martinez, R. (2022). Negotiation of meaning in child-child vs. adult-adult interactions: Evidence from low proficiency EFL learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching,* 60(2), 463-489.

Lazaraton, A. (2009). Discourse analysis. In *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction* (pp. 242-259). Palgrave Macmillan.

Lee, L. (2001). Online interaction: negotiation of meaning and strategies used among learners of Spanish. *ReCALL*, 13(02).

Lee, H., Hampel, R., & Kukulska-Hulme, A. (2019). Gesture in speaking tasks beyond the classroom: An exploration of the multimodal negotiation of meaning via Skype videoconferencing on mobile devices. *System*, 81, 26–38.

Lee, M. J., McLoughlin, C., & Chan, A. (2008). Talk the talk: Learner-generated podcasts as catalysts for knowledge creation. *British Journal of Educational Technology,* 39(3), 501-521.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newberry Park.

Littleton, K., & Whitelock, D. (2005). The negotiation and co-construction of meaning and understanding within a postgraduate online learning community. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 30(2), 147-164.

Loewen, S., & Gonulal, T. (2014, August). Task-based interaction in Turkish. Paper presented at *International Association of Applied Linguistics conference* (AILA), Brisbane, Australia.

Long, M. H. (1980). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation*. University of California, Los Angeles.

Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/nonnative speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 126–141.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 180-240). Academic Press.

Luan, N. L., & Sappathy, S. M. (2011). L2 Vocabulary acquisition: The impact of negotiated interaction. *GEMA: Online Journal of Language Studies*, 11(2), 5-20.

Mariotti, C. (2006). Negotiated interactions and repair patterns in CLIL settings. *VIEWS*, 13, 33-40.

McHugh, M. L. (2012). Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochemia medica*, 22(3), 276-282.

Oliver, R. (1998). Negotiation of meaning in child interactions. The relationship between conversational interaction and second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 372–386.

Oliver, R. (2002). The patterns of negotiation for meaning in child interactions. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86, 97–111.

Oliver, R. (2009). How young is too young? Investigating negotiation of meaning and feedback in children aged five to seven years. In *Multiple perspectives on interaction* (pp. 141-162). Routledge.

Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985). The role of group work in classroom second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7, 233–248.

Pica, T., Kanagy, R., & Falodun, J. (1993). Choosing and using communication tasks for second language instruction and research. In G. Crookes & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks and language learning: Integrating theory and practice* (pp. 9–34). Multilingual Matters.

Prior, M. T., & Talmy, S. (2019). A discursive psychological approach to the analysis of talk and text in applied linguistics. In *The Routledge handbook of research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 474-487). Routledge.

Potter, J. (2012). Discursive psychology and discourse analysis. In J. P. Gee and M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 104-119.

Rosell-Aguilar, F. (2007). Top of the pods—In search of a podcasting “pedagogy” for language learning. *Computer Assisted language learning*, 20(5), 471-492.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2013). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Routledge.

Satar, H. M. (2015). Sustaining multimodal language learner interactions online. *CALICO Journal*, 32(3), 480–507.

Scarcella, R., & Higa, C. (1981). Input, negotiation, and age differences in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 31 (2), 409.

Schegloff, E. (1993). Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on language and social interaction*, 26, 99–128.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361–382.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up Closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4). https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1973.8.4.289

Shekary, M., & Tahririan, M. H. (2006). Negotiation of meaning and noticing in text-based online chat. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(4), 557-573.

Shibata, N. (2022). Turn-Taking and Negotiation of Meaning to Construct an Online Conversation Between Two Low- Intermediate Japanese EFL Learners. *Language Education and Technology (LET Journal),* 2(1), 26-37.

Si-Qing, C. (1990). A Study of Communication Strategies in Interlanguage Pro-

duction by Chinese EFL Learners. Language Learning, 40(2):155-187.

Smith, B. (2003) Computer-mediated negotiated interaction: An expanded model. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(1): 38–57.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 371–391.

Taylor, S. (2013). *What is discourse analysis?.* Bloomsbury Academic.

Tarone, E. (1981). Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15, 285–295.

Tecedor, M. (2023). Negotiated interactions in cross-cultural video-mediated virtual exchanges. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-24.

Uztosun, M., & Erten, İ. (2014). The impact of English proficiency on the use of communication strategies: An interaction-based study in Turkish EFL context. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10(2).

Varonis, E., & Gass, S. M. (1985). Nonnative–nonnative conversations: a model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 71–90.

Voigt, J. (1994). Negotiation of mathematical meaning and learning mathematics*. Educational studies in mathematics*, 26, 275-298.

Wang, H. C. (2019). The influence of creative task engagement on English L2 learners' negotiation of meaning in oral communication tasks. *System*, 80, 83-94.

Wang, Q., & Castro, C. D. (2010). Classroom interaction and language output. *English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 175-186.

Warschauer, M. (1997) Computer-mediated collaborative learning: theory and practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81: 470–481.

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman.

Wigham, C. R., & Chanier, T. (2013). A study of verbal and nonverbal communication in second life – the ARCHI21 experience. ReCALL, 25(1), 63–84.

Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction*. Sage.

Yaman, S., Irgin, P., & Kavasoğlu, M. (2013). Communication strategies: Implications for EFL university students. *Journal of educational sciences research*, 3(2), 255-268.

Yaman, Ş., & Özcan, M. (2014). Oral communication strategies used by Turkish students learning English as a foreign language. In *Issues in teaching, learning and testing speaking in a second language* (pp. 143-158). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Ya-ni, Z. (2007). Communication strategies and foreign language learning. *US-China Foreign Language*, 5, 43-48.

Yuksel, D., & Inan, B. (2014). The effects of communication mode on negotiation of meaning and its noticing. *ReCALL,* 26(3), 333-354.

Yuniarti, Y. (2017). The effect of teaching oral communication strategies on Indonesian EFL learners' speaking skill. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 3(2), 193-202.

APPENDIX-A: JEFFERSON (2004) TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTION

Symbol	Use
[text]	Indicates the start and end points of overlapping speech.
=	Indicates the break and subsequent continuation of a single interrupted utterance.
(1.0)	A number in parentheses indicates the time, in seconds, of a pause in speech.
(.)	A brief pause, usually less than 0.2 seconds.
text↓	Indicates falling pitch.
text↑	Indicates rising pitch.
,	Indicates a temporary rise or fall in intonation.
tex-	Indicates an abrupt halt or interruption in utterance.
>text<	Indicates that the enclosed speech was delivered more rapidly than usual for the speaker.
<text>	Indicates that the enclosed speech was delivered more slowly than usual for the speaker.
°text°	Indicates whisper or reduced volume speech.
TEXT	Indicates shouted or increased volume speech.
<u>text</u>	Indicates the speaker is emphasizing or stressing the speech.
te:::xt	Indicates prolongation of an utterance.
(hhh)	Audible exhalation
(.hhh)	Audible inhalation
((text))	Indicates non-verbal moves such as laughing or yawning.

APPENDIX-B: Consent Form

Negotiated Meaning Moves in Online Problem-Based Tasks in EFL Courses

This is a study about problem-based online tasks and negotiation of meaning, conducted by Ata Can SEZGİN who is currently an MA student in ELT at Hacettepe University under the supervision of Prof. Nuray ALAGÖZLÜ. This is an MA thesis study and the researcher is kindly requesting you to participate. The main goal is to learn about English as Foreign Language students' meaning making strategies in online English courses and to identify the reoccurring types of negotiation moves they employ during problem-based tasks. It is important to conduct research on how language learners use meaning making strategies and understand incoming messages better as it will enable researchers to understand how students overcome breakdowns during the conversation.

The researcher requests your consent for participation in the study. This consent form asks you to allow the researcher to use your comments to enhance understanding of the topic. The form also asks your permission to use related answers, images, or posts as data in this study. Participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you decide not to participate, there will not be any negative consequences. You have the right to withdraw from the research in case of any inconvenience or abuse that may occur during data collection. The researcher will maintain the confidentiality of the research records or data. By submitting this form, you are indicating that you have read the description of the study and that you agree to the terms as described. This consent form is in accordance with the rules of the Institute of Educational Science at Hacettepe University and Hacettepe University Ethics Commission has given the permission to conduct this research.

If you have any questions or would like a copy of this consent letter, please contact me.

Thank you in advance for your participation.
Ata Can SEZGİN

I agree to participate in the research study. I understand the purpose and nature of this study and I am participating voluntarily. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time. I grant permission for the data generated from this interview to be used in the researcher's publications on this topic.

Your signature:

APPENDIX-C: Ethics Committee Approval

Tarih: 21/06/2023 13:49
Sayı: E-35853172-300-00002911581
00002911581

T.C.
HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Rektörlük

Sayı : E-35853172-300-00002911581 21/06/2023
Konu : Etik Komisyon İzni (Ata Can SEZGİN)

EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

İlgi: 25.05.2023 tarihli ve E-51944218-300-00002864820 sayılı yazınız.

Enstitünüz Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi **Ata Can SEZGİN'**in, **Prof. Dr. Nuray ALAGÖZLÜ** sorumluluğunda yürüttüğü **"EFL Derslerinde Probleme Dayalı Çevrimiçi Görevlerde Anlam Söyleşmesi Hareketleri**" başlıklı tez çalışması, Üniversitemiz Senatosu Etik Komisyonunun **13 Haziran 2023** tarihinde yapmış olduğu toplantıda incelenmiş olup, etik açıdan uygun bulunmuştur.

Bilgilerinizi ve gereğini rica ederim.

Prof. Dr. Sibel AKSU YILDIRIM
Rektör Yardımcısı

Bu belge güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

Belge Doğrulama Kodu: 10E5B3DF-9FA4-458B-900A-D4AA97A680F4 Belge Doğrulama Adresi: https://www.turkiye.gov.tr/hu-ebys

Adres: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Rektörlük 06100 Sıhhiye-Ankara
E-posta:yazimd@hacettepe.edu.tr İnternet Adresi: www.hacettepe.edu.tr Elektronik Ağ: www.hacettepe.edu.tr
Telefon: 0 (312) 305 3001-3002 Faks:0 (312) 311 9992
Kep: hacettepeuniversitesi@hs01.kep.tr

Bilgi için: Musa KAYA
Memur
Telefon: 3051008

APPENDIX-D: Declaration of Ethical Conduct

I hereby declare that…

- I have prepared this thesis in accordance with the thesis writing guidelines of the Graduate School of Educational Sciences of Hacettepe University;
- all information and documents in the thesis/dissertation have been obtained in accordance with academic regulations;
- all audio visual and written information and results have been presented in compliance with scientific and ethical standards;
- in case of using other people's work, related studies have been cited in accordance with scientific and ethical standards;
- all cited studies have been fully and decently referenced and included in the list of References;
- I did not do any distortion and/or manipulation on the data set,
- and **NO** part of this work was presented as a part of any other thesis study at this or any other university.

../.../....

Ata Can SEZGİN

APPENDIX-E: Thesis Originality Report

21/01/2024

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
Graduate School of Educational Sciences
To The Department of Foreign Language Education

Thesis Title: NEGOTIATED MEANING MOVES IN ONLINE PROBLEM-BASED TASKS IN EFL COURSES

The whole thesis that includes the *title page, introduction, main chapters, conclusions and bibliography section* is checked by using **Turnitin** plagiarism detection software take into the consideration requested filtering options. According to the originality report obtained data are as below.

Time Submitted	Page Count	Character Count	Date of Thesis Defense	Similarity Index	Submission ID
21/01/2024	125	148201	16/01/2024	%10	2264932616

Filtering options applied:
1. Bibliography excluded
2. Quotes included
3. Match size up to 5 words excluded

I declare that I have carefully read Hacettepe University Graduate School of Educational Sciences Guidelines for Obtaining and Using Thesis Originality Reports; that according to the maximum similarity index values specified in the Guidelines, my thesis does not include any form of plagiarism; that in any future detection of possible infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility; and that all the information I have provided is correct to the best of my knowledge.

I respectfully submit this for approval.

Name Lastname: Ata Can SEZGİN
Student No.: N20137436
Department: Foreign Language Education
Program: English Language Education
Status: ☒ Masters ☐ Ph.D. ☐ Integrated Ph.D.

Signature

ADVISOR APPROVAL

APPROVED
Prof. Dr. Nuray ALAGÖZLÜ

APPENDIX-F: Yayımlama ve Fikrî Mülkiyet Hakları Beyanı

Enstitü tarafından onaylanan lisansüstü tezimin/raporumun tamamını veya herhangi bir kısmını, basılı (kâğıt) ve elektronik formatta arşivleme ve aşağıda verilen koşullarla kullanıma açma iznini Hacettepe Üniversitesine verdiğimi bildiririm. Bu izinle Üniversiteye verilen kullanım hakları dışındaki tüm fikri mülkiyet haklarım bende kalacak, tezimin tamamının ya da bir bölümünün gelecekteki çalışmalarda (makale, kitap, lisans ve patent vb.) kullanım haklan bana ait olacaktır.

Tezin kendi orijinal çalışmam olduğunu, başkalarının haklarını ihlal etmediğimi ve tezimin tek yetkili sahibi olduğumu beyan ve taahhüt ederim. Tezimde yer alan telif hakkı bulunan ve sahiplerinden yazılı izin alınarak kullanılması zorunlu metinlerin yazılı izin alınarak kullandığımı ve istenildiğinde suretlerini Üniversiteye teslim etmeyi taahhüt ederim.

Yükseköğretim Kurulu tarafından yayınlanan "**Lisansüstü Tezlerin Elektronik Ortamda Toplanması, Düzenlenmesi ve Erişime Açılmasına ilişkin Yönerge**" kapsamında tezim aşağıda belirtilen koşullar haricince YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi / H.Ü. Kütüphaneleri Açık Erişim Sisteminde erişime açılır.

- Enstitü/ Fakülte yönetim kurulu kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihinden itibaren 2 yıl ertelenmiştir. (1)
- Enstitü/Fakülte yönetim kurulunun gerekçeli kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihimden itibaren … ay ertelenmiştir. (2)
- Tezimle ilgili gizlilik kararı verilmiştir. (3)

../../2024

Ata Can SEZGİN

"Lisansüstü Tezlerin Elektronik Ortamda Toplanması, Düzenlenmesi ve Erişime Açılmasına İlişkin Yönerge"

(1) *Madde 6. 1. Lisansüstü tezle ilgili patent başvurusu yapılması veya patent* alma *sürecinin devam etmesi durumunda, tez danışmanının önerisi ve enstitü anabilim dalının uygun görüşü Üzerine enstitü veya fakülte yönetim kurulu iki yıl süre ile tezin erişime açılmasının ertelenmesine karar verebilir.*

(2) *Madde 6.* 2. *Yeni teknik, materyal ve metotların kullanıldığı, henüz makaleye dönüşmemiş veya patent gibi yöntemlerle korunmamış ve internetten paylaşılması durumunda 3. şahıslara veya kurumlara haksız kazanç; imkânı oluşturabilecek bilgi ve bulguları içeren tezler hakkında tez danışmanın önerisi ve enstitü anabilim dalının uygun görüşü üzerine enstitü veya fakülte yönetim kurulunun gerekçeli kararı ile altı ayı aşmamak üzere tezin erişime açılması engellenebilir.*

(3) *Madde* 7. *1. Ulusal çıkarları veya güvenliği ilgilendiren, emniyet, istihbarat, savunma ve güvenlik, sağlık vb. konulara ilişkin lisansüstü tezlerle ilgili gizlilik kararı, tezin yapıldığı kurum tarafından verilir*. Kurum ve kuruluşlarla yapılan işbirliği protokolü çerçevesinde hazırlanan lisansüstü tezlere ilişkin gizlilik kararı ise, ilgili kurum ve kuruluşun önerisi ile enstitü veya fakültenin uygun görüşü Üzerine üniversite yönetim kurulu tarafından verilir. Gizlilik kararı verilen tezler Yükseköğretim Kuruluna bildirilir.*

Madde 7.2. *Gizlilik kararı verilen tezler gizlilik süresince enstitü veya fakülte tarafından gizlilik kuralları çerçevesinde muhafaza edilir, gizlilik kararının kaldırılması halinde Tez Otomasyon Sistemine yüklenir*

**Tez danışmanının önerisi ve enstitü anabilim dalının uygun görüşü üzerine enstitü veya fakülte yönetim kurulu tarafından karar verilir*